



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 10]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च 7, 1992/फाल्गुन 17, 1913

No. 10] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1992/PHALGUNA 17, 1913

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—अप-खण्ड (II)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (II)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the
Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकाया तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, P.G. & PENSIONS

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

(Department of Personnel & Training)

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

क्र.सं. 703:- केन्द्र सरकार दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा श्री दिलीप सरकार, अधिवक्ता, अगर्ताला को विशेष जज, (वेस्ट), अगर्ताला और मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, अगर्ताला के न्यायालय में विचारण के लिए सम्वित इंडियन ड्रग्स एण्ड फार्मास्यूटिकल्स लिमिटेड के कनिष्ठ पदधारियों और द्वायर्स ट्रांसपोर्ट, कलकत्ता के निदेशकों के विरुद्ध केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण दलों के मामले और सी 4/80-सी.आई.ए. (III) में मामला सं. 7/86 और 575/86 (पुराना) के अधिवर्जन का संचालन करने के लिए विशेष लोक अधिवर्जक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

S.O. 703.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Dilip Sarkar, Advocate, Agartala as Special Public Prosecutor for the purpose of conducting the trial of the Delhi Special Police Establishment case No. RC 4/80-CIU(III) (Case No. 7/86 pending trial in the Court of Special Judge (West), Agartala and Case No. 575/86 (Old) pending trial in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Agartala, against certain officials of the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. and Directors of Doors Transport, Calcutta

[संख्या 225/21/91-ए.सी.डी.-II]

[No. 225/21/91-AVD. II]

ए.सी. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

A. C. SHARMA, Under Secy.

(1263)

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1992

का.प्र. 704—राजस्व अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "दि बंगाल टेबल टेनिस एसोसिएशन, कलकत्ता" को 1990-91 से 1992-93 तक के कर-निर्धारण वर्षों के लिए निम्न-लिखित शर्तों के अधीन रखने हुए, उक्त खण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करता है, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर-निर्धारिता उसकी आय का हस्तेमान प्रथम उसकी आय का हस्तेमान करने के लिए उसका संचयन इस प्रकार के संचयन हेतु उक्त खण्ड (23) द्वारा यथा-संशोधित धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) तथा (3) के उपबंधों के अनुरूप पूर्णतया तथा अन्तर्गत उस उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा, जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है ;
- (ii) कर-निर्धारिता उपर-उल्लिखित क-निर्धारण वर्षों में संगत पूर्व-वर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उप-धारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक वस्तु अथवा तरीकों से निम्न तरीकों से उसकी निधि (ज्वर-जवाहिरान, फर्नीचर अथवा किसी अन्य वस्तु, जिसे उपर्युक्त खण्ड (23) के तमाम परन्तुक के अधीन बोर्ड द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाए, के हा में प्राप्त तथा रख-रखाव में स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से निम्न) का भ्रमण नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा ;
- (iii) कर-निर्धारिता अपने सदस्यों को किसी भी तरीके से अपनी आय के किसी भाग का संचितरण अपने से संबद्ध किसी एसोसिएशन अथवा संस्था को अनुदान के अलावा नहीं करेगा ; और
- (iv) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगी जोकि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाष हों जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर-निर्धारिता के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अन्य से लेखा-पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों ।

[अधिसूचना संख्या : 8990 का.सं. 196/17/90-आ.का.नि.-I]

शरत चन्द्र, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 704.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (23) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "The Bengal Table Tennis Association, Calcutta" for the purpose of the said clause for the assessment years 1990-91 to 1992-93 subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate it for application, in consonance with the provisions of sub-section (2) and (3) of section 11 as modified by the said clause (23) for such accumulation, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;

(ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture, or any other article as may be notified by the Board under the third proviso to the aforesaid clause (23) for any period during the previous year(s) relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of section 11;

(iii) the assessee will not distribute any part of its income in any manner to its members except as grants to any association or institution affiliated to it; and

(iv) this notification will not apply in relation to any income, being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business.

[Notification No. 8990/F. No. 196/17/90-IT.A.1]

SHARAT CHANDRA, Under Secy.

आर्थिक कार्य विभाग

(वैकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 1992

का.प्र. 705—यस: बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 की धारा 45 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा उसके अनुरूप केन्द्रीय सरकार ने नेशनल बैंक आफ लाहौर, वि. दिल्ली के भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के साथ विलय के लिए 20 फरवरी, 1970 को एक योजना मजूर की थी ।

यस: उक्त योजना के खण्ड 6 के उपखण्ड (ix) के अधीन भारतीय स्टेट बैंक द्वारा नेशनल बैंक आफ लाहौर लि., दिल्ली की परिसम्पत्तियों का अन्तिम रूप से मूल्यांकन नियत तारीख से बारह वर्षों का समाप्ति के पश्चात् अपेक्षित था जो कि नियत तारीख को अन्तिम रूप से मूल्यांकन कर लिया गया है ।

यस: भारतीय स्टेट बैंक ने यह प्रस्तावित किया है कि उरी संस्था में परिसम्पत्तियों अन्तर्गत होने और बैंक के प्रयासों के बावजूद अधिकांश सर्वो की वसूलियां अभी बाकी होने के कारण बैंक, निम्न योजना के खण्ड 6 के उपखण्ड (ix) में विनिर्दिष्ट समय के भीतर परिसम्पत्तियों का अन्तिम रूप से मूल्यांकन करने में अग्रसर रहा है ।

और यस: केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के बाद इस बात से संतुष्ट है कि विलय योजना की लागू करने में कठिनाई पैदा हो गई है और उचित समय बचाकर शिष्ट में परिसम्पत्तियों का अन्तिम रूप से मूल्यांकन प्रयोज्य है, उक्त कठिनाई को दूर करना जरूरी है ।

अतः अब नेशनल बैंक आफ लाहौर लि., दिल्ली को भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के साथ विलय की 20 फरवरी, 1970 की विलय योजना के खण्ड 21 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश देती है कि भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के परामर्श से तथा उसके अनुमोदन से नेशनल बैंक आफ लाहौर लि., दिल्ली की उस परिसम्पत्तियों का, जिसकी वसूली और मूल्यांकन नहीं हुआ है, नियत तारीख से तेरह वर्षों की अवधि के भीतर मूल्यांकन कर लेगा ।

[सं 17/6/82-बी.ओ.-II]

के.के. मंगल, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 17th February, 1992

S.O. 705.—Whereas on 20th February, 1970 a scheme of amalgamation of the National Bank of Lahore Ltd., Delhi with the State Bank of India was sanctioned by the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by and in accordance with Section 45 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949.

Whereas under Sub-clause (ix) of Clause 6 of the said Scheme, the State Bank of India was required to make a final valuation of the assets of the National Bank of Lahore Ltd., Delhi, which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, on the expiry of twelve years from the prescribed date.

Whereas the State Bank of India has represented that in view of the large number of assets involved and the recovery of most of the items yet to be realised in spite of its efforts, it has not been able to make the final valuation within the time specified in sub-clause (ix) of Clause 6 of the Scheme of amalgamation.

And whereas the Central Government in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India is satisfied that a difficulty has arisen in giving effect to the scheme of amalgamation which it is necessary to remove by extending the time within which the final valuation of assets is required to be made.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 21 of the Scheme of amalgamation dated 20th February, 1970 of the National Bank of Lahore Ltd., Delhi with the State Bank of India, the Central Government hereby directs that the State Bank of India shall in consultation with and with the approval of the Reserve Bank of India value the assets of the National Bank of Lahore Ltd., Delhi which have not been realised and valued within a period of twenty three years from the prescribed date.

[No. 17/6/82-B.O. III]

K. K. MANGAL, Under Secy.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 706:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निम्नलिखित (व्यापारिक निरीक्षण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स पेस्ट मोर्टन इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, जी-2 सुन्दर टावर, टी.जे. रोड, सेवरी (प.), बम्बई-400015 को (i) तेल रहित चावल की मुमी और (ii) इंडियों का चूरा गींग तथा खुरों का निर्यात से पूर्व छुआँकरण के लिए इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए दत्त शर्तों के अधीन मान्यता देती है कि उक्त अधिसूचना तेल रहित चावल की मुमी के निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (4) तथा इंडियों का चूरा गींग तथा खुरों के निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 के नियम 5 के अन्तर्गत छुआँकरण का प्रमाण पत्र देने के लिए उक्त अधिसूचना द्वारा उपनाई गई पद्धति को अंग करने के संबंध में निर्यात निरीक्षण परियोजना द्वारा मनोनीत किसी भी अधिकारी को पर्याप्त सुविधाएं देगा।

[फा० सं. 5/4/92-ई आई एण्ड ई पी]

ए.के. चौधरी, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 18th February, 1992

S.O. 706.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby recognises for a period of three years from the date of publication of this notification M/s. Pest Morten (India) Pvt. Ltd., G-2, Sunder Tower, T.J. Road, Sewree (W), Bombay-400015 as an agency for the fumigation of (i) De-oiled Rice Bran and (ii) Crushed Bones, Horns and Hooves prior to their export subject to the condition that the said agency shall give adequate facilities to any officer nominated by the Export Inspection Council in this behalf to examine the method of fumigation followed by the said Agency in granting the certificate of fumigation under sub-rule (4) of rule 4 of the Export of De-oiled Rice Bran (Inspection) Rules, 1966 and rule 5 of the Export of Crushed Bones, Horns and Hooves (Inspection) Rules, 1977.

[F. No. 5/4/92-EI&EP]

A. K. CHAUDHURI, Director

बम्बई संवाद

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 707:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में बम्बई मंत्रालय के अन्तर्गत आने वाली निम्नलिखित मिलों को जिनके 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारी बन्दूक से हिन्दी कार्य का साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :-

1. इंडिया यूनाइटेड मिल नं. 1, बम्बई
2. इंडिया यूनाइटेड मिल नं. 2, बम्बई
3. इंडिया यूनाइटेड मिल नं. 3, बम्बई
4. इंडिया यूनाइटेड मिल नं. 4, बम्बई
5. इंडिया यूनाइटेड मिल नं. 5, बम्बई
6. इंडिया यूनाइटेड डायवर्स, बम्बई
7. माइल मिल, नागपुर
8. विवर्ध मिल, बेरार, अमलपुर
9. सवितराम राम प्रसाद मिल, अकोला,

[सं. ई-11011/18/89-हिन्दी]

कोमि कुमार, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF TEXTILES

New Delhi, the 17th February, 1992

S.O. 707.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule 4 of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official Purposes of the Union), Rule, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following Mills under the Ministry of Textiles whereof more than 80 per cent staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :

1. India United Mill No. 1, Bombay
2. India United Mill No. 2, Bombay
3. India United Mill No. 3, Bombay
4. India United Mill No. 4, Bombay

5. India United Mill No. 5, Bombay
6. India United Dyeworks, Bombay
7. Model Mills, Nagpur
8. Vidarbha Mill, Berar, Achalpur
9. Sawatram Ram Prasad Mills, Akola.

(पदेन), शिक्षा विभाग

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय।

[स. एक. 27-33/88-प्र.ग.]

एम. आर. तायल, निदेशक

[No. E-11011/18/89-Hindi]

KIRTHY KUMAR, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Education)

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय

(शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 1992

New Delhi, the 17th February, 1992

S.O. 708.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 11 read with section 12 of the Auroville Foundation Act, 1988 (54 of 1988), the Central Government nominates with effect from the date of issue of this notification, the following person as member to the Governing Board of the Auroville Foundation, and modifies the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Human Resource Development issued vide S.O. 481 dated the 30th January, 1991, published in Part-II Section 3, Sub-section (ii) in the Gazette of India as follows, namely:—

In the said notification, for item 8 and entry relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"8. Shri S. K. Banerjee,
Financial Adviser
(Ex-Officio),
Department of Education
Ministry of Human Resource Development."

S. R. TAYAL, Director

[No. F. 27-33/88-UU]

का.आ. 708:—ऑरोविल प्रतिष्ठान अधिनियम, 1988 की धारा 12 के साथ पठित धारा 11 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्ति का इस अधिसूचना के जारी होने की तारीख से ऑरोविल प्रतिष्ठान के शासी बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में नामांकन करती है तथा मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय में दिनांक 30 जनवरी 1991 को क्रम सं. 481 द्वारा जारी तथा भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :-

उक्त अधिसूचना में, मद 8 तथा उससे संबंधित प्रावशिष्टी के लिए निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जावेगा :-

"ड. श्री एस.के. बनर्जी

वित्तीय सलाहकार

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 709:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 12 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, उक्त अधिनियम की द्वितीय अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अनुसूची में "पाकिस्तान" शीर्ष के नीचे प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां जोड़ी जाएंगी, अर्थात्:—

कराची विश्वविद्यालय	एम. बी. बी. एस.	बैचलर ऑफ मेडिसिन एण्ड बैचलर कराची विश्वविद्यालय ऑफ सर्जरी
सिंध विश्वविद्यालय	एम. बी. बी. एस.	बैचलर ऑफ मेडिसिन एण्ड बैचलर सिंध विश्वविद्यालय ऑफ सर्जरी
पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय	एम. बी.	बैचलर ऑफ मेडिसिन एण्ड बैचलर पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय ऑफ सर्जरी

[सं. बी. 11015/35/90—एम. ई. (जी.)]

आर. विजयकुमारी, डैस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE
(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 14th February 1992

S.O. 709 :—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section(3) of section 12 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following further amendment in the Second Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the said Schedule, under the heading "PAKISTAN", after the existing entries, the following entries shall be added, namely:—

University of Karachi	M.B.B.S.	Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery	U. Karachi
University of Sind	M.B.B.S.	Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery	U. Sind
University of Punjab	M.B.B.S.	Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery	U. Punjab."

[No. V-11015/35/90-ME(UG)]
R. VIJAYAKUMARI, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 710.—केन्द्रीय सरकार केन्द्रीय होमियोपैथी परिषद अधिनियम, 1973 (1973 का 59) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय होमियोपैथी परिषद से परामर्श करके उक्त अधिनियम की दूसरी अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

दूसरी अनुसूची में "महाराष्ट्र" शीर्ष के अधीन क्रम संख्यांक 16 घ और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

विश्वविद्यालय/बोर्ड या चिकित्सा संस्था मान्यताप्राप्त चिकित्सीय अर्हता पंजीकरण के लिए संक्षिप्त नाम टिप्पणियाँ का नाम

1	2	3	4
"11ड. कोर्ट ऑफ एग्जामिनर्स ऑफ होमियोपैथी चिकित्सा विज्ञान डी एच एम एम 1987 से और आगे होमियोपैथीक एंड बायोकेमिक सिस्टम और शल्य चिकित्सा में (केन्द्रीय होमियोपैथी परिषद आफ मेडिसिन, मुम्बई। डिप्लोमा विनियमन)			

[सं. बी. 27021/17/87—होमियो]

आर. के. मुखी, निदेशक,

पाठ टिप्पण :—मूल अधिसूचना भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड (i) में का. आ. सं. 76, तारीख 20 दिसम्बर, 1973 द्वारा अधिसूचित की गई थी। इसके पश्चात् इसे भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2 खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में तारीख 14 नवम्बर, 1990 की अधिसूचना सं. बी. 27021/7/87—होमियो. द्वारा संशोधित किया गया।

New Delhi, the 20th February 1992

S.O. 710.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 13 of the Homoeopathy Central Council Act, 1973 (59 of 1973), the Central Government, after consulting the central council of Homoeopathy, hereby makes the following further amendment in the Second Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the Second Schedule, under the head "MAHARASHTRA" after serial number 11D and entries relating thereto, the following shall be inserted, namely:—

Name of the University Board or Medical Institution	Recognised Medical qualification	Abbreviation for registration	Remarks
"11E. Court of Examiners of Homoeopathic and Bio-chemic System of Medicine, Bombay.	Diploma in Homoeopathy Medicine and Surgery.	D.H.M.S. (CCH Regulation)	From 1987 onwards

[No. V. 27021/17/87-Homoe]

R.K. MUKHI, Director

Foot Note : The Principal Notification was notified in the Gazette of India Part 2, Section I, vide S.O. No. 76, dated the 20th December, 1973. This was subsequently amended vide Notification No. V.27021/7/87-Homoeo dated the 14th November, 1990.

कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 711:—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 17 मार्च, 1990 पृष्ठ 774—775 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (कोयला विभाग) की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 659 तारीख 15 फरवरी, 1990 द्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र में की भूमि में जिसका माप 590.644 हैक्टर (लगभग) या 1459.48 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

2. और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमि के भाग में कोयला अधिप्राप्त है।

3. और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 905 तारीख 4 अप्रैल, 1987 द्वारा, कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता (पिन—700001) को सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

4. अतः, अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 590.641 हैक्टर (लगभग) या 1459.47 एकड़ (लगभग) माप की भूमि में खनन अधिकारों का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

5. इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. एस. ई. सी. एल. : बी. एस. पी. : जी. एम. (पी. आई. जी.) ; 95 तारीख 23 अगस्त, 1991 का निरोक्षण कलकत्ता बिलासपुर (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता (पिन 700001) के कार्यालय में या माउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि. (राजस्व अनुभाग), सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर—495001 (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

6. कोई भी व्यक्ति जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से तीस दिन के भीतर, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र की प्रतियां जिसमें यह अधिसूचना प्रकाशित की गई थी, जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है। उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के अधीन लिखित में उक्त सक्षम प्राधिकारी को सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

राजगमर सुदुर उत्तर—विस्तार ब्लाक

कोरबा—कोयला क्षेत्र—जिला बिलासपुर (मध्य प्रदेश)

खनन अधिकार					
क्र. सं.	ग्राम	हल्का सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हैक्टरों में टिप्पण
1.	केसला	7	कोरबा	बिलासपुर	124.264 भाग
2.	गोरमा	7	कोरबा	बिलासपुर	321.191 भाग
3.	ठाकुरकेटा	7	कोरबा	बिलासपुर	145.186 पूरा

कुल : 590.641 हैक्टर (लगभग)

या 1459.47 एकड़ (लगभग)

केसला ग्राम (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉटों की संख्या: 49 (भाग), 50 (भाग), 51 में 78, 79 (भाग) 80 (भाग), 81 और 82

गोरमा ग्राम (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉटों की संख्या (भाग) सर्वेक्षण नहीं हुआ।

ठाकुरकेटा ग्राम (सम्पूर्ण) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉटों की संख्या: 1 में 101

सीमा वर्णन :

क—ख—ग	रेखा, ग्राम बेला-केसला की सम्मिलित सीमा पर "क" बिन्दु से आरंभ होती है और ग्राम केसला में प्लॉट संख्यांक 50,49 और प्लॉट सं. 82 को दर्शनी सीमा से होकर जाती है, उसके पश्चात् प्लॉट सं. 80, 79 से होकर जाती है और गागा: केसला-गोरमा ग्राम की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ चलती है और "ग" बिन्दु पर मिलती है।
ग—घ—ङ	रेखा गोरमा ग्राम (गैर सर्वेक्षित) से होकर गुजरती है उसके पश्चात् भागल: ग्राम ठाकुरकेटा—तेलव-नारा की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ चलती है और "ङ" बिन्दु पर मिलती है।
ङ—च—छ	रेखा ग्राम ठाकुरकेटा—पटरापाली, ठाकुरकेटा—बेला की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और "च" बिन्दु पर मिलती है।
ज—झ—ञ	रेखा ग्राम गोरमा—बेला, केसला—बेला की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ चलते हुए आरंभिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. 43015/27/89—एल. एस. डब्ल्यू.]

बी. बी. राव, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1992

S.O. 711—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Coal) No. S.O. 659, dated the 15th February, 1990 issued under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in part II, Section, 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 17th March, 1990 at pages 774 to 775, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 590.644 hectares (approximately) or 1450.48 acres (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification.

2. And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said lands described in the Schedule appended to this notification ;

3. And whereas the Coal Controller, I, Council House Street, Calcutta (PIN 700001) has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under section 3 of the said Act, vide notification No. S.O. 905, dated the 4th April, 1987.

4. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the lands measuring 590.641 hectares (approximately) or 1459.47 acres (approximately) in Mining Rights, described in the Schedule appended hereto.

5. The plan bearing No. SECL:BSP:GM(PIG) : 95 dated the 23rd August, 1991, of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the Office of the Collector, Bilaspur (Madhya Pradesh) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, I, Council House street, Calcutta (PIN 700001) or in the Office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited, (Revenue Section), Seepat Road, Bilaspur-495001 (Madhya Pradesh).

6. Any person interested in the lands described in the Schedule appended to this notification may within thirty days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, file objection in writing, under section 8 of the said Act to the said competent authority with regard to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the lands or any rights in or over the said lands.

SCHEDULE

BA GAMAR FOR NORTH EXTENSION BLOCK

KORBA COALFIELD

DISTRICT—BILASPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

MINING RIGHTS

Sl. Village No.	Halka Number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1. Kesla	7	Korba	Bilaspur	124.264	part
2. Gorma	7	Korba	Bilaspur	321.191	part
3. Thakurkheta	7	Korba	Bilaspur	145.186	full
Total:—				390.641 hectares (approximately)	
				OR	
				1459.47 acres (approximately)	

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Kesla (part).

49 (part) 50 (part), 51 to 78, 79 (part) 80 (part), 81 & 82.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Gorma (part).

Un-surveyed.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Thakurkheta (full).

1 to 101.

Boundary Description :—

A-B-C	Line starts from point 'A' on the common boundary of village Bela-kesla and proceeds in village Kesla through plot numbers 50, 49 southern boundary of number 82 then through plot numbers 80, 79 and partly along the common boundary of Kesla-Gorma village and meets at point 'C'.
C-D-E	Line passes through village Gorma (un-surveyed) then along the partly common boundary of villages Thakurkheta-Telwanara, and meets at point 'E'.
E-F-G-H	Line passes along the common boundary of village Thakurkheta-Patrapali, Thakurkheta-Bela and meets at point 'H'.
H-I-A	Line passes along the common boundary of villages Gorma-Bela. Kesla-Bela and meets at the starting point "A".

[No. 43015/27/89-LSW]

B.B. RAO, Under Secy.

परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग

शंवेई, 17 जनवरी, 1992

का. आ. 712—परमाणु ऊर्जा (खानों, खनिजों के कार्य स्थलों एवं निर्धारित पदार्थों के हस्तन) के नियमावली 1984 के नियम 2 के खण्ड (ग) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार परमाणु ऊर्जा

विभाग की दिनांक 3 फरवरी, 1988 की अधिसूचना में विधिक संश्लेषण सं. 1227 का अधिकरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, एन.द्वारा अखण्ड परमाणु ऊर्जा नियामक बोर्ड, परमाणु ऊर्जा आयोग को उक्त नियमों द्वारा प्रदत्त सक्षम प्राधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए, "सक्षम प्राधिकारी" के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं 18/1/(5)/91-ई अवर]

आर. स्वामीनाथन, उप सचिव

DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Bombay, the 17th January, 1992

S.O. 712.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of Rule 2 of the Atomic Energy (Working of Mines, Minerals and Handling of Prescribed Substances) Rules 1984, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy No. S.O. 1227 dated February 3, 1988, the Central Government hereby appoints the Chairman, Atomic Energy Regulatory Board of the Atomic Energy Commission, as the "Competent Authority" to exercise the powers conferred on the Competent authority by the said Rules.

[No. 18/1(5)/91-FR]

R. SWAMINATHAN, Dy. Secy.

बम्बई 17 जनवरी, 1992

का. आ. 713—परमाणु ऊर्जा (रेडियो सक्रिय अपशिष्टों के सुरक्षापूर्ण निपटान) के नियमावली 1987 के नियम 2 के खण्ड (vii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार, परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग की दिनांक 14 दिसम्बर, 1987 के अधिसूचना में सांविधिक आदेश सं. 427 के अधिक्रमण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा अध्यक्ष, परमाणु ऊर्जा नियामक बोर्ड, परमाणु ऊर्जा आयोग को, उक्त नियमों द्वारा प्रदत्त, सक्षम प्राधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग के लिए "सक्षम प्राधिकारी" के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. 18/1(5)/91-ई आर]

आर. स्वामीनाथन, उप सचिव

Bombay, the 17th January, 1992

S.O. 713.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (vii) of Rule 2 of the Atomic Energy (Safe Disposal of Radioactive Wastes) Rules 1987, and in supersession of the

notification of the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy No. S.O. 427 dated December 14, 1987, the Central Government hereby appoints the Chairman, Atomic Energy Regulatory Board of the Atomic Energy Commission, as the "Competent Authority" to exercise the powers conferred on the Competent authority by the said Rules.

[No. 18/1(5)/91-ER]

R. SWAMINATHAN, Dy. Secy.

बम्बई 17 जनवरी, 1992

का. आ. 714—विकिरण संरक्षण नियमावली 1971 के नियम 2 के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग की अधिसूचना दिनांक 12 जनवरी 1979 के सांविधिक आदेश की अधिसूचनाएं सं. 981 दिनांक 7 दिसम्बर के सांविधिक आदेश 428 का अधिक्रमण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा अध्यक्ष परमाणु ऊर्जा नियामक बोर्ड, परमाणु ऊर्जा आयोग को उक्त नियमों द्वारा प्रदत्त सक्षम प्राधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए "सक्षम प्राधिकारी" के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. 18/1(5)/91-ई आर]

आर. स्वामीनाथन, उप सचिव

Bombay, the 17th January, 1992

S.O. 714.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Rule 2 of the Radiation Protection Rules, 1971, and in supersession of the Notifications of the Govt. of India in the Deptt. of Atomic Energy No. S.O. 981 dated 12th January, 1979 and No. S.O. 428 dated December 7, 1987, the Central Government hereby appoints the Chairman, Atomic Energy Regulatory Board of the Atomic Energy Commission, as the "Competent Authority" to exercise the powers conferred on the Competent authority by the said Rules.

[No. 18/1(5)/91-ER]

R. SWAMINATHAN, Dy. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मन्त्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 715.—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मोरि-I से जि. सि. एस. नगर तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणों में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की आज्ञा की घोषणा करती है।

बेधार्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी संक्षेप प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदिर, आन्ध्रप्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज करते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. फ्लो लाइन मोरि-I से जि. सि. एस. नगरम

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश; मंडल : मामिडिकुदुरु; जिला : पूरव गोदावरि

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हेक्टास	एर्स	सेन्टियस	एकर्स	सेन्टस
नगरम	93-1ए	0	15	5	0	38
	92-ए	0	09	5	0	23
	92-सी	0	07	5	0	19
	94-4ए	—	—	—	—	—
	94-4बी	0	10	5	0	26
	92-3	0	14	5	0	35
	103-पीटी	0	07	5	0	19
	104-पीटी	0	02	5	0	06
	105-1	0	08	0	0	20
	105-2	0	05	5	0	14
	106-3	0	02	5	0	06
	106-1 पीटी	0	04	5	0	11
	106-2ए	0	03	0	0	07
	106-2बी	0	01	0	0	03
	106-4	0	02	5	0	06
ह	108-1	0	02	5	0	06
	108-2	0	04	5	0	11
	112-8पीटी	0	01	0	0	02
	116-पीटी	0	02	0	0	05
	115-पीटी	0	00	5	0	01
	113-4	0	17	0	0	42
	113-1 पीटी	0	03	5	0	09
	112-7ई	0	04	0	0	10
	113-1/2ए	0	03	5	0	09
	157-1 पीटी	0	03	5	0	09½
	113-3 पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
	157-2	0	07	0	0	16½

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	156	0	03	0	0	08
	163	0	03	0	0	08
	165-8 पी टी	0	16	0	0	39
	164-1 पी टी	0	06	0	0	15
	164-2 पी टी	0	11	0	0	27
	167-1 पी टी	0	16	0	0	39
	167-3 पी टी	0	03	0	0	08
	167-4	0	03	0	0	08
	167-2	0	14	5	0	36
	169-1 पी टी	0	09	0	0	22
	169-2 पी टी	0	09	5	0	23
	166-पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	112-7 बी	0	01	5	0	02 1/2
	112-6 बी		04	5	0	11
	112-8 सी	0	02	5	0	06
	112-5 बी } 112-5 सी }	0	03	0	0	08
	कुल मिलाकर	2	55	51	6	301/2

[सं. ओ.—12016/194/91—ओ एन जी डी-4]

एम. मार्टिन, डैस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 715.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Mori I to G.C.S. Nagaram in A.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533 103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. pipe flow line from MORI-I to G.C.S. Nagaram

State : Andhra Pradesh

Mandal : Mamidikuduru

District : East Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hectars	Ares	Centriares	Acres	Cents
Nagaram	93-1A	0	15	5	0	38
	92-A	0	09	5	0	23
	92-C	0	07	5	0	19
	94-4A	—	—	—	—	—
	94-4B	0	10	5	0	26

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	92-3	0	14	5	0	35
	103-pt	0	07	5	0	19
	104-pt	0	02	5	0	06
	105-1	0	08	0	0	20
	105-2 }	0	05	5	0	14
	106-3 }	0	02	5	0	06
	106-pt	0	04	5	0	11
	106-2A	0	03	0	0	07
	106-2B	0	01	0	0	03
	106-4	0	02	5	0	06
	108-1	0	02	5	0	06
	108-2	0	04	5	0	11
	112-8pt	0	01	0	0	02
	116-pt	0	02	0	0	05
	115-pt	0	00	5	0	01
	113-4	0	17	0	0	42
	113-1pt	0	03	5	0	09
	112-7E	0	04	0	0	10
	113-1A	0	03	5	0	09
	157-1pt	0	03	5	0	09½
	113-3pt	0	04	0	0	10
	157-2	0	07	0	0	16½
	156	0	03	0	0	08
	163	0	03	0	0	08
	165-8pt	0	16	0	0	39
	164-1pt	0	06	0	0	15
	164-2pt	0	11	0	0	27
	167-1pt	0	16	0	0	39
	167-3pt	0	03	0	0	08
	167-4	0	03	0	0	08
	167-2	0	14	5	0	36
	169-1pt	0	09	0	0	22
	169-2pt	0	09	5	0	23
	166-pt	0	02	5	0	06
	112-7D	0	01	5	0	02½
	112-6D	0	04	5	0	11
	112-6L	0	02	5	0	06
	112-5B }	0	03	0	0	08
	112-5C }	—	—	—	—	—
Grand Total		2	55	5	6	30½

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 716.—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मोरि-I से जि. सि. एस. नगरम तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी संक्षेप प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंघि, आन्ध्रप्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपनानित प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ऐ. यु. पाइप लाइन मोरि-I से जि. सि. एस. नगरम

स्टेट : आंध्र प्रदेश; जिला: पूरब गोदावरि; मंडल : राजोल

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हेक्टेअर्स	एर्स	सेन्टिएर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टस
कडलि ब्लाक I	48/2 पी टी	0	05	0	0	12
	48/3 पी टी	0	18	5	0	46
	54/पी टी	0	19	5	0	48
	55/पी टी	0	18	5	0	46
	49/3 ए	0	03	0	0	08
	78/2 पी टी	0	17	0	0	42
	70/पी टी	0	17	0	0	42
	68/1 बी	0	00	5	0	01
	68/1 सी	0	01	5	0	04
	68/1 एफ	0	03	0	0	07
	59/ए	0	09	0	0	22
	59/बी 2	0	15	5	0	38
	56	0	10	0	0	25
	68	0	04	0	0	10
	68/1 जी	0	03	0	0	08
	68/1 के	0	03	0	0	08
	68/एल	0	03	0	0	08
	69/2 बी 2,3	0	09	5	0	23
	78/1 पी टी, 2 पी टी	0	17	0	0	42
	91/2 पी टी	0	15	0	0	37
	78/1 पी टी					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	78/2 पी टी					
	78/2 पी टी	0	05	0	0	12
	78/2 पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	82/1 पी टी	0	18	0	0	45
	82/1 पी टी	0	01	5	0	04
	83/1 पी टी, 2 पी टी	0	03	5	0	09
	83/1 पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	83/1 पी टी	0	01	0	0	03
	83/1 पी टी	0	01	0	0	03
	83/1 पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	90/1 पी टी	0	16	5	0	41
	91/2 पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	90/2	0	18	0	0	44
	90/2 पी टी	0	02	0	0	05
	91/2	0	02	0	0	05
	91/2 पी टी	0	03	0	0	07
	117/1 पी टी	0	09	5		23
	91/2 पी टी	0	01	0	0	03
	91/2 पी टी	0	01	0	5	03
	95/1 पी टी	0	09	5	0	24
	116/1 पी टी	0	02	0	0	05
	95/1, 7 पी टी	0	07	0	0	17
	94/4 पी टी	0	01	0	0	02
	117/1 पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	93/पी टी	0	03	0	0	07
	117/1 पी टी	0	00	5	0	01
	118/1 पी टी	0	05	5	0	14
	117/1 पी टी	0	08	0	0	20
	118/3	0	04	5	0	11
	118/4 पी टी	0	05	5	0	13
	118/5 पी टी					
	122/1 पी टी	0	07	5	0	19
	122/2 पी टी	0	08	0	0	20
	114/4	0	09	5	0	24
	114/3, 5, 6	0	06	0	0	15
	113/1 पी टी	0	01	0	0	03
	136/1 पी टी	0	08	5	0	21
	113/1 पी टी	0	03	5	0	09
	112/1 पी टी	0	01	5	0	04
	कुल मिलाकर	3	80	0	9	43

[सं. प्रो.—12016/195/91—प्रो. एन. जॉ. डी.-4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 716.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Mori I to G.C.S. Nagaram in A.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533 103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipe line from Mori I to G.C.S. Nagaram

State : Andhra Pradesh, Dist : East Godavari, Mandal Razole

Village	R.S.No.	Hectares	Ares	Centiares	Acres	Cents
Kadali Block I	48/2 PT	0	05	0	0	12
	48/3PT	0	18	5	0	46
	54/PT	0	19	5	0	48
	55/PT	0	18	5	0	46
	49					
	—A	0	03	0	0	08
	3					
	78/2PT	0	17	0	0	42
	70/PT	0	17	0	0	42
	68/1B	0	00	5	0	01
	68/1C	0	01	5	0	04
	68/1f	0	03	0	0	07
	59/A	0	09	0	0	22
	59/B2	0	15	5	0	38
	56	0	10	0	0	25
	68	0	04	0	0	10
	68/1G	0	03	0	0	08
	68/1K	0	03	0	0	08
	68/L	0	03	0	0	08
	69/2B, 2, 3	0	09	5	0	23
	78/1PT, 2PT	0	17	0	0	42
	91/2PT	0	15	0	0	37
	78/1PT					
	78/2PT					
	78/2PT	0	05	0	0	12
	78/2PT	0	02	5	0	06
	82/1PT	0	18	0	0	45
	82/1PT	0	01	5	0	04
	83/1PT, 2PT	0	03	5	0	09
	83/1PT	0	02	5	0	06
	83/1PT	0	01	0	0	03

1.	2	3	4	5	6	7
	83/1PT	0	01	0	0	03
	83/1PT	0	02	5	0	06
	90/1PT	0	16	5	0	41
	91/2PT	0	02	5	0	06
	90/2	0	18	0	0	44
	90/2PT	0	02	0	0	05
	91/2PT	0	02	0	0	05
	91/2Pt.	0	03	0	0	07
	117/1Pt.	0	09	5	0	23
	91/2Pt.	0	01	0	0	03
	91/2Pt.	0	01	0	0	03
	95/1Pt.	0	09	5	0	24
	116/1Pt.	0	02	0	0	05
	95/1, 7Pt.	6	07	0	0	17
	94/4Pt.	0	01	0	0	02
	117/1Pt.	0	02	5	0	06
	93/Pt.	0	03	0	x	07
	117/1Pt.	0	00	5	0	01
	118/1Pt.	0	05	5	0	14
	117/1Pt.	0	08	0	0	20
	118/3	0	04	5	0	11
	118/4Pt. } 118/5Pt. }	0	05	5	0	13
	122/1Pt.	0	07	5	0	19
	122/2Pt.	0	08	0	0	20
	114/4	0	09	5	0	24
	114/3, 5, 6	0	06	0	0	15
	113/1Pt.	0	01	0	0	03
	136/1Pt.	0	08	5	0	21
	113/1Pt.	0	03	5	0	09
	112/1Pt.	0	01	5	0	04
Grand Total		3	80	0	9	43

[No. O-12016/195/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 717 .—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मोरि- से जि. सि. एम. नगरम तह तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है ।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है ।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की आज्ञा की घोषणा करती है

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी संक्षेप प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदी, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराने समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. पाइप लाइन मोरि-1 से जि. मि. एस. नगरम

स्टेट : आंध्र प्रदेश; जिला: पूरब गोदावरी; मंडल: राजोल

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हेक्टेयर	एर्स	सेन्टियर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टम
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
कडलि-बि-3	731/पी टी	0	01	0	0	02
	725-2/1	0	11	5	0	29
	725-2/2	0	06	5	0	16
	727-1	0	05	5	0	13
	728-3	0	07	5	0	18
	725-3	0	05	5	0	14
	725-4	0	05	5	0	14
	728-1	0	02	5	0	06
	722-1	0	00	5	0	01
	728-2	0	02	5	0	06
	728-4	0	01	0	0	02
	722-2	0	06	0	0	15
	722-3	0	04	0	0	10
	741-1	0	05	0	0	12
	741-2	0	03	0	0	08
	742-पी टी	0	02	0	0	05
	742-2	0	01	5	0	04
	742-3	0	03	0	0	07
	474-3 पी टी	0	05	0	0	12
	471-1 पी टी	0	09	5	0	23
	721-1 पी टी	0	00	5	0	01
	470-1	0	15	0	0	37
	470-2	0	07	5	0	19
	472-पी टी	0	08	0	0	20
	471-पी टी	0	07	0	0	17
	393-पी टी	0	03	0	0	07
	394-पी टी	0	03	0	0	07
	395-1 पी टी	0	00	5	0	01
	396-2 पी टी	0	05	5	0	13
	396-1 पी टी	0	08	5	0	21

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	397/1 पी टी	0	05	0	0	12
	397/2 पी टी	0	04	5	0	11
	397/3 पी टी	0	04	0	0	10
	397/4 पी टी	0	03	5	0	09
	403/1 पी टी	0	04	5	0	11
	401/2 पी टी	0	19	5	0	48
	403/2 पी टी	0	09	5	0	23
	378/1 पी टी	0	08	0	0	20
	402/2 पी टी	0	09	5	0	23
	401/1 पी टी	0	07	0	0	17
	401/3 पी टी	0	09	0	0	22
	378/3 पी टी	0	11	5	0	29
	384/पी टी	0	02	0	0	05
	380/1 पी टी	0	12	0	0	30
	380/2 पी टी	0	09	5	0	24
	380/4 पी टी	0	06	5	0	16
	380/3 पी टी	0	00	5	0	01
	380/5 पी टी	0	01	5	0	04
	381/पी टी	0	01	5	0	04
	378/2 पी टी	0	02	0	0	05
	378/3 पी टी	0	11	5	0	29
	374/पी टी	0	14	0	0	34
	376/1 पी टी	0	10	5	0	26
	377/पी टी	0	03	0	0	07
	377/पी टी	0	01	0	0	02
		3	18	0	7	82

[सं. ओ.—12016/196/91—ओ. एन. जी. डी.- 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 717.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Mori-I to G.C.S. Nagaram in A.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexure hereto :

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Mine-

ral Pipelines (Acquisition of Right User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Pipe line at "MORI-I" to "G.C.S. Nagaram" .

State : Andhra Pradesh,

District : East Godavari,

Mandal : Razole

Village	R.S. No.	Hectars	Acres	Centiares	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kadali-B.3	731-Pt	0	01	0	0	02
	725-2/1	0	11	5	0	29
	725-2/2	0	06	5	0	16
	727-1	0	05	5	0	13
	728-3	0	07	5	0	18
	725-3	0	05	5	0	14
	725-4	0	05	5	0	14
	728-1	0	02	5	0	06
	722-1	0	00	5	0	01
	728-2	0	02	5	0	06
	728-4	0	01	0	0	02
	722-2	0	06	0	0	15
	—3	0	04	0	0	10
	741-1	0	05	0	0	12
	741-2	0	03	0	0	08
	742-Pt	0	02	0	0	05
	742-2	0	01	5	0	04
	742-3	0	03	0	0	07
	474-3Pt.	0	05	0	0	12
	471-1Pt.	0	09	5	0	23
	721-1Pt	0	00	5	0	01
	470-1	0	15	0	0	37
	470-2	0	07	5	0	19
	472-Pt	0	08	0	0	20
	471-Pt	0	07	0	0	17
	393-Pt	0	03	0	0	07
	394-Pt	0	03	0	0	07
	395-1Pt	0	00	5	x	01
	396-2Pt	0	05	5	0	13
	396-1Pt	0	08	5	0	21
	397-1Pt	0	05	0	0	12
	397-2Pt	0	04	5	0	11
	397-3Pt	0	04	0	0	10
	397-4Pt	0	03	5	0	09
	403-1Pt	0	04	5	0	11
	401-2Pt	0	19	5	0	48
	403-2Pt	0	09	5	0	23
	378-1Pt	0	08	0	0	20

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kadali B-3—Contd.	402-2Pt	0	09	5	0	23
	401-1Pt	0	07	0	0	17
	401-3Pt	0	09	0	0	22
	378-3Pt	0	11	5	0	29
	384-Pt	0	02	0	0	05
	380-1Pt	0	12	0	0	30
	3802Pt	0	09	5	0	24
	380-4Pt	0	06	5	0	16
	380-3Pt	0	00	5	0	01
	380-5Pt	0	01	5	0	04
	381-Pt	0	01	5	0	04
	378-2Pt	0	02	5	0	05
	378-3Pt	0	11	5	0	29
	374-Pt	0	14	0	0	34
	376-1Pt	0	10	5	0	26
	377-Pt	0	03	0	0	07
	377-Pt	0	01	0	0	02
TOTAL :		3	18	0	7	82

[No. O-12016/196/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 718:—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रो-लियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत नणुक् से गौननि सालवेन्ट्स तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है ;

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है ;

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति मक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदि, आन्ध्रप्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

पाइप लाइन तणुकु से गोधामि

जिला : पश्चिम गोदावरी

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश

मंडल : उन्नाजावरम

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हेक्टेयर्स	एजें	सेन्टियर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टस
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	32-5	0	00	5	0	01
	31-8	0	17	0	0	42
	29-7 सी	0	06	0	0	15
	29-7 बी	0	03	0	0	08
	29-7 ए	0	03	0	0	07
	29-1	0	01	5	0	04
	21-4	0	07	0	0	17
	21-3	0	03	0	0	08
	21-2, बी/5	0	01	0	0	03
	21-2 ए	0	05	0	0	12
	21-1	0	01	5	0	04
	20-2, 1	0	20	0	0	49
	19-4	0	08	5	0	21
	19-1	0	12	0	0	30
	10-3	0	11	5	0	28
	10-1/2	0	10	5	0	26
	3-1	0	17	5	0	43
	2-1 }	0	13	5	0	33
	2-3 }					
	2-2	0	06	0	0	15
	32-8	0	01	0	0	02
	31-9	0	01	0	0	02
	31-4	0	01	5	0	04
	29-6	0	01	0	0	03
	19-5 बी	0	00	5	0	01
		1	53	0	3	78

[सं. ओ—12016/198/91-ओ एन जी डी-4]

एम मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 718.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Tanuku to Gowtami Soulents in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

Pipe line from Tanuku to Gowthamy Solvents

State : Andhra Pradesh

K. Sivaram Village, Undrajavaram Mandalam; West Godavary District

Village	R.S. Nos	Hectacr	Ares	Centiares	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	32-5	0	00	5	0	01
	31-8	0	17	0	0	42
	29-7C	0	06	0	0	15
	29-7B	0	03	0	0	08
	29-7A	0	03	0	0	07
	29-1	0	01	5	0	04
	21-4	0	07	0	0	17
	21-3	0	03	0	0	08
	21-2B } 5 }	0	01	0	0	03
	21-2A	0	05	0	0	12
	21-1	0	01	5	0	04
	20-2 } 1 }	0	20	0	0	49
K. Savaram	19-4	0	08	5	0	21
	19-1	0	12	0	0	30
	10-3	0	11	5	0	28
	10-1 } 2 }	0	10	5	0	26
	3-1	0	17	5	0	43
	2-1	0	13	5	0	33
	2-3	0	06	0	0	15
	32-8	0	01	0	0	02
	31-9	0	01	0	0	02
	31-4	0	01	5	0	04
	29-6	0	01	0	0	03
	19-5B	0	00	5	0	01
		1	53	0	3	78

[No. O-12016/198/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 719 :—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रो-लियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत पेरवल्लि से कोम्बूर तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है। और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट भूमेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमन्त्रि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विषय रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. गैस पाइप लाइन पेरवलि से कोव्वूर

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश

डिवीज : वाडापल्लि

मंडल : कोव्वूर

जिला : पश्चिमी गोवावरि

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हैक्टेयर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टीयर्स	एकर्स	सेन्ट्स
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
वाडापल्लि	417/2 बी	0	22	5	0	56
	417/1 पी टी	0	06	0	0	15
	421/1 पीटी	0	24	0	0	59
	419/1,2	0	20	5	0	51
	421	0	0	5	0	01
	420/1 ए	0	08	0	0	20
	420/1 बी	0	11	5	0	28
	403 पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
	400/1 बी	0	12	0	0	30
	400/2C पीटी	0	01	5	0	04
	399/10 पीटी	0	05	0	0	12
	1 सी पी टी	0	09	5	0	24
	1 बी पी टी	0	08	0	0	20
	399/1 ए पीटी	0	05	5	0	13
	257/1 पीटी	0	01	0	0	02
	/1 पीटी	0	16	0	0	40
	259/1 पीटी	0	12	0	0	30
	1 ए पीटी	0	16	0	0	39
	260/1 बीपीटी	0	11	5	0	28
	2 बी पीटी	0	0	5	0	01
	260/1 सीपीटी	0	05	0	0	12
	1एपीटी	0	0	5	0	01

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	260/2 एपीटी	0	11	5	0	29
वाडापल्लि	262 पीटी	0	16	0	0	39
	263 पीटी	0	26	0	0	64
	264 पीटी	0	03	0	0	08
	269 पीटी	0	07	0	0	17
	271/203 पीटी	0	11	5	0	29
	271/5 एण्ड 4 पीटी	0	07	5	0	19
	257/1 पीटी	0	23	0	0	57
	99/3 ए एण्ड 3 बी	0	11	5	0	28
	99/2 पीटी	0	05	5	0	13
	99/1 पीटी	0	05	0	0	12
	96/2	0	01	0	0	03
	2 पीटी	0	11	5	0	28
	1 पीटी	0	11	5	0	29
	88 पीटी	0	12	5	1	31
	88 पीटी	0	14	5	0	35
	87 पीटी	0	13	5	0	33
	84/3 पीटी	0	12	0	0	30
	84/1 पीटी	0	15	5	0	38
	83	0	05	0	0	12
		4	65	0	11	50

[सं. ओ-12016/199/ओ एन जी डी-4]

एम० मार्टिन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 719.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Peravali to Kovur in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103);

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.,

SCHEDULE

ROU Gas Pipe Line from Peravali to Kovvur

State : Andhra Pradesh

Village : Vadapalli
Mandal : Kovvur
District : West Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hectares	Ares	Cent Ares	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vadapalli	417/2B	0	22	5	0	56
	417/1 pt	0	06	0	0	15

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vadapalli (contd.)	421/1 pt	0	24	0	0	59
	419/1, 2	0	20	5	0	51
	421	0	0	5	0	01
	420/1A	0	08	0	0	20
	420/1 B	0	11	5	0	28
	403 pt	0	04	0	0	10
	400/1 B	0	12	0	0	30
	400/2 C pt	0	01	5	0	04
	399/1D pt	0	05	0	0	12
	1C pt	0	09	5	0	24
	1B pt	0	08	0	0	20
	399/1A pt	0	05	5	0	13
	257/1 pt	0	01	0	0	02
	1 pt	0	16	0	0	40
	259/1 pt	0	12	0	0	30
	1A pt	0	16	0	0	39
	260/1D pt	0	11	5	0	28
	2B pt	0	0	5	0	01
	260/1C pt	0	05	0	0	12
	1A pt	0	0	5	0	01
	260/2A pt	0	11	5	0	29
	262 pt	0	16	0	0	39
	263 pt	0	26	0	0	64
	264 pt	0	03	0	0	08
	269 pt	0	07	0	0	17
	271/233 pt	0	11	5	0	29
	271/534 pt	0	07	5	0	19
	257/1 pt	0	23	0	0	57
	99/3A & 3B	0	11	5	0	28
	99/2 pt	0	05	5	0	13
	99/1 pt	0	05	0	0	12
	96/2	0	01	0	0	03
	2 pt	0	11	5	0	28
	1 pt	0	11	5	0	29
	88 pt	0	12	5	1	31
	88 pt	0	14	5	0	35
	87 pt	0	13	5	0	33
	84/3 pt	0	12	0	0	30
	84/1 pt	0	15	5	0	38
	83	0	05	0	0	12
		4	65	0	11	50

[No. O-12016/199/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 720 :—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रो-लियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस खाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत पेरबलि से पंगिडि तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उम पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है ;

बैशर्त कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी नेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के, जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूमेकरणा कार्यालय, राजमन्दि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है ;

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

[सं ओ-12016/200/91-ओएम जीडी-4]

अनुसूची

टेम्पार ओ यू गैस पाइप लाइन पेरवलि मेपिंगिडि

स्टेट : आंध्र प्रदेश

जिला : पश्चिम गोदावरी

मंडल : कोव्वूर

विलेज : दोवेरु

शॉव	आर एस नं.	हेक्टेर्स	एर्स	सेन्टीग्रस	एकर्स	सेन्टम
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
दोप्पेरु	625 पीटी	0	03	0	0	08
	624-2 बी	0	16	0	0	40
	624-2 सी	0	04	0	0	10
	623-1 बी,	0	09	0	0	22
	2 बी	0	01	0	0	03
	623-2ए	0	09	0	0	22
	617-1ए	0	01	0	0	03
	471-2 पीटी	0	0	5	0	01
		0	03	0	0	07
	618-2 ए 2	0	28	0	0	69
	615-1 पीटी	0	02	0	0	05
		0	01	04	0	03
	622-2 पार्ट	0	01	5	0	04
	615-2 ए 2	0	26	5	0	65
	615-2 बी 2	0	14	0	0	34
	615-1 पीटी	0	52	5	1	30
	584-3 पीटी	0	03	0	0	07
	583-2 बीपीटी	0	18	0	0	45
	584-2 बी } 583-5 पीटी }	0	33	5	0	83
	583-2 एपीटी	0	08	0	0	20
	523-2 एपीटी	0	08	5	0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
दोपेरु	582-3 पीटी	0	27	5	0	68
	471-3 ए पीटी	0	09	5	0	24
	471-3 बी पीटी	0	24	5	0	61
	471-3 सी पीटी	0	13	0	0	32
	469-1 बी पीटी	0	01	0	0	02
	469-1 ए पीटी	0	05	0	0	12
	461-4 पीटी	0	0	5	0	01
	462-2 पीटी	0	40	5	1	00
	452-2 पीटी	0	03	0	0	07
	3 पीटी	0	02	5	0	06
	4 पीटी	0	03	0	0	07
	1 ए पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
		0	01	0	0	02
	453-1 पीटी	0	13	5	0	
	452-1 पीटी बी	0	02	0	0	05
	453-1 पीटी	0	08	0	0	20
	458-2	0	09	0	0	22
	458-3 ए	0	08	5	0	21
	458-3 सी	0	12	0	0	30
	456-2 पीटी	0	47	0	1	16
	442-1 पीटी	0	03	5	0	09
	441-2 पीटी	0	36	5	0	90
	441-1 पीटी	0	13	0	0	32
	434-2 पीटी	0	75	5	1	86
	436-2 पीटी	0	09	5	0	23
	388-1 बी	0	05	5	0	13
	388-2ए	0	06	0	0	15
	387-1 बी	0	06	0	0	15
	388-2 बी	0	04	5	0	11
	345-2 पी	0	24	5	0	60
	342-5 पीटी	0	0	5	0	01
	342-6 पीटी	0	03	0	0	07
	342-8 पीटी	0	07	0	0	17
	387-2ए	0	27	0	0	67
	386-1 पी	0	06	0	0	15
	370-2 बी	0	07	0	0	17
	381-2	0	04	5	0	11
	379-2 पीटी	0	08	0	0	20
	379-1	0	01	0	0	02
	378-2	0	0	5	0	01
	370-1 बी	0	21	5	0	53

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
बोपेह	368-1 बी	0	27	5	0	68
	364-2 पी	0	20	0	0	50
	377-2 पी	0	16	5	0	41
	377-3 पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
	370-3 बी	0	17	0	0	42
	377-4 पीटी	0	09	5	0	23
	370-3/3 बी	0	05	5	0	13
	369-5 पीटी	0	06	5	0	16
	369-2 पीटी	0	13	5	0	33
	369-6 पीटी	0	07	5	0	18
	369-4 पीटी	0	04	5	0	11
	369-5 पीटी	0	03	5	0	09
	369-1 पीटी	0	08	5	0	21
	364-3 पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
	364-4 पीटी	0	01	0	0	02
	363-1 पीटी	0	23	5	0	58
	362-4 पीटी	0	16	0	0	40
	362-7 पीटी	0	08	5	0	21
	362-8 पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
	362-4 पीटी	0	03	5	04	09
	362-6 पीटी	0	10	5	0	26
		0	04	0	0	10
	356-2 पीटी	0	45	5	1	12
	357-2	0	14	0	0	34
	346-5 सी	0	06	5	0	16
	346-5 डी पीटी	0	13	5	0	33
	346-5 बी	0	11	5	0	28
	346-5 ए	0	09	5	0	23
	346-3 डी पीटी	5	06	5	0	16
	346-2 सी पीटी	0	04	5	0	11
	346-1 बी पीटी	0	01	0	0	02
	346-1 एफ	0	05	5	0	14
	346-1 एफ	0	05	5	0	13
	581-2 पीटी	0	04	5	0	11
	460-2 पीटी	0	02	0	0	05
		10	97	5	27	05

[सं. ओ-12016/200/91—ओ एम जी डी 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 720.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Peravali to Pangidi in A.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Peravali to Pangidi

State : Andhra Pradesh

District : West Godavari

Mandal : Kovvur

Village : Dommeru

Village	R.S. Nos.	Hectars	Ares	Centiares	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dommeru	625 pt	0	03	0	0	08
	624-2B	0	16	0	0	40
	624-2C	0	04	0	0	10
	623-1B	0	09	0	0	22
	623-2B	0	01	0	0	03
	623-2A	0	09	0	0	22
	617-1A	0	01	0	0	03
	471-2 pt	0	0	5	0	01
		0	03	0	0	07
	618-2A 2	0	28	0	0	69
	615-1 pt	0	02	0	0	05
		0	01	0	0	03
	622-2 part	0	01	5	0	04
	615-2A2	0	26	5	0	65
	615-2B2	0	14	0	0	34
	615-1 pt	0	52	5	1	30
	584-3 pt	0	03	0	0	07
	583-2 B pt	0	18	0	0	45
	584-2B					
		0	33	5	0	83
	583-5 pt					
	583-2A pt	0	08	0	0	20
	523-2A pt	0	08	5	0	21
	582-3 pt	0	27	5	0	68
	471-3A pt	0	09	5	0	24
	471-3B pt	0	24	5	0	61
	471-3C pt	0	13	0	0	32
	469-1B pt	0	01	0	0	02
	469-1A pt	0	05	0	0	12
	461-4 pt	0	0	5	0	01
	462-2 pt	0	40	5	1	00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dommeru	452-2 pt	0	03	0	0	07
	3 pt	0	02	5	0	06
	4 pt	0	03	0	0	07
	1A pt	0	04	0	0	10
		0	01	0	0	02
	453-1 pt	0	13	5	0	33
	452-1B pt	0	02	0	0	05
	453-1 pt	0	08	0	0	20
	458-2		09	0	0	22
	458-3A	0	08	5	0	21
	3C	0	12	0	0	30
	456-2 pt	0	47	0	1	16
	442-1 pt	0	03	5	0	09
	441-2 pt	0	36	5	0	90
	441-1 pt	0	13	0	0	32
	434-2 pt		75	5	1	86
	436-2 pt	0	09	5	0	23
	388-1B	0	05	5	0	13
	2A	0	06	0	0	15
	387-1B	0	06	0	0	15
	388-2B	0	04	5	0	11
	345-2P	0	24	5	0	60
	342-5pt	0	0	5	0	01
	6 pt	0	03	0	0	07
	8 pt	0	07	0	0	17
	387-2A	0	27	0	0	67
	386-1P	0	06	0	0	15
	370-2B	0	07	0	0	17
	381-2	0	04	5	0	11
	379-2pt	0	08	0	0	20
	379-1	0	01	0	0	02
	378-2	0	0	5	0	01
	370-1B	0	21	5	0	53
	368-1B	0	27	5	0	68
	364-2P	0	20	0	0	50
	377-2P	0	16	5	0	41
	377-3 pt	0	04	0	0	10
	370-3B	0	17	0	0	42
	377-4 pt	0	09	5	0	23
	370-3/3B	0	05	5	0	13
	369-5 pt	0	06	5	0	16
	369-2 pt	0	13	5	0	33
	369-6 pt	0	07	5	0	18
	369-4 pt	0	04	5	0	11
	369-5 pt	0	03	5	0	09
	1 pt	0	08	5	0	21
	364-3 pt	0	04	0	0	10
	364-4 pt	0	01	0	0	02

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dorreri	363—1 pt	0	23	5	0	58
	362—4 pt	0	16	0	0	40
	7 pt	0	08	5	0	21
	8 pt	0	04	0	0	10
	362—4 pt	0	03	5	0	09
	362—6 pt	0	10	5	0	26
	362—6 pt	0	04	0	0	10
	356—2 pt	0	45	5	1	12
	357—2	0	14	0	0	34
	346—5 C	0	06	5	0	16
	346—5 Dpt	0	13	5	0	33
	346—5 B	0	11	5	0	28
	346—5 A	0	09	5	0	23
	346—3 Dpt	0	06	5	0	16
	346—2 Cpt	0	04	5	0	11
	346—1 Gpt	0	01	0	0	02
	346—1 E	0	05	5	0	14
	1 F	0	05	5	0	13
	581—2 pt	0	04	5	0	11
	460—2 pt	0	02	0	0	05
		10	97	5	27	05

[No. O-12016/200/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का० आ. 721.....जब कि केन्द्रीय सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मानेपल्ली I से जिमिएस ताटिवाका तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाईप लाईन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एनडू द्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बनते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाईप लाईन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूमेकरणा कार्यालय, राजमंदि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराने समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मन प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

प्रिड्यून

आर ओ यू गैस पाइप लाइन मानेपल्ली से जिमिएस ताटिवाका

स्टेट—आन्ध्र प्रदेश

जिला—पूर्व गोदावरी

मंडल—मामिडिकूडूरु

गांव	ए.म. नं.	हेक्टेअर	ए.सं	सेन्टि.मं	ए.क.सं	सेन्टि.मं
मानेपल्ली	235—5वीं	0	03	0	0	08
	5मी	0	03	5	0	09
	235—5 डी	0	03	0	0	08
	237—1ए	0	02	0	0	05
	237—2ए	0	02	0	0	05
	237—3ए	0	04	0	0	10
	237—4ए	0	03	5	0	09
	237—5ए	0	01	5	0	04
	237—5बी	0	01	5	0	04

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	237-6ए	0	03	5	0	09
	7ए	0	03	5	0	09
	237-7बी	0	04	5	0	11
	258-ए	0	02	5	0	06
	248-2ए	0	13	5	0	33
	249-2बी	0	06	0	0	15
	247-1ए	0	07	5	0	19
	247-1बी	0	04	5	0	11
	247-1बी	0	04	5	0	11
	247-1सी	0	05	5	0	13
	247-2ए	0	09	0	0	22
	246-2	0	02	0	0	05
	455-1बी	0	10	0	0	25
	455-2ए	0	01	5	0	04
	455-2बी/2	0	03	0	0	07
	255-2सी/2	0	12	5	0	31
	455-2डी/2					
	460-ए.2 पीटी	0	17	0	0	42
	461-पीटी	0	06	5	0	16
	478-3ए	0	05	5	0	13
	478-3बी पीटी	0	02	5	0	06
	479-1 बी	0	06	5	0	16
	478-1एपीटी	0	02	0	0	05
	479-1डी	0	01	5	0	04
	479-4बी	0	08	5	0	21
	479-4सी	0	05	5	0	13
	476-3बी	0	03	0	0	08
	4-ए					
	473-2पी	0	02	0	0	05
		1	73	5	4	31

[सं. ओ. 12016/201/91-ओ एन जीडी 4]

एम. माटिन, डेप्ट. अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 721.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Mamapali to G.C.S. Takipaka in A. P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Manepalli to G.C.S. Tatipaka

STATE : Andhra Pradesh District : East Godavari Mandal : Manidi Kuduru

Village	S. No.	Hectares	Ares	Centi Ares	Acres	Cents
Manepalli	235-B	0	03	0	0	08
	5 C	0	03	5	0	09
	235-5D	0	03	0	0	08
	237-1A	0	02	0	0	05
	237-2A	0	02	0	0	05
	237-3A	0	04	0	0	10
	237-4A	0	03	5	0	09
	237-5A	0	01	5	0	04
	237-5B	0	01	5	0	04
	237-6A	0	03	5	0	09
	237-7A	0	03	5	0	09
	237-7B	0	04	5	0	11
	258-A	0	02	5	0	06
	248-2A	0	13	5	0	33
	249-2B	0	06	0	0	15
	247-1A	0	07	5	0	19
	247-1B	0	04	5	0	11
	247-1C	0	05	5	0	13
	247-2A	0	09	0	0	22
	246-2	0	02	0	0	05
	455-1B	0	10	0	0	25
	455-2A	0	01	5	0	04
	455-2B/2	0	03	0	0	07
	455-2C/2	0	12	5	0	31
	2D/2					
	460-A2 pt	0	17	0	0	42
	461-pt	0	06	5	0	16
	478-3A	0	05	5	0	13
	478-3B pt	0	02	5	0	06
	479-1B	0	06	5	0	16
	478-1A pt	0	02	0	0	05
	479-1D	0	01	5	0	04
	479-4B	0	08	5	0	21
	479-4C	0	05	5	0	13
	476-3B	0	03	0	0	08
	4A					
	473-2P	0	02	0	0	05
		1	73	5	4	31

[No. O-12016/201/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी 1992

का. आ. 722—जबकि केन्द्रीय सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मानेपलि 1 से जि. जि. एस ताटिपाका तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्द्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के जि. प्रोजेक्ट भूसेकरणा कार्यालय राजमंछि आन्ध्रप्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

तालिका

आर. ओ. थु. गैस पाइप लाइन मानेपलि-1 से वि. सि. एस ताटिपाका

स्टेट—आन्ध्रप्रदेश	डिवीजन—बाइबुपल्लि	मंडल—गन्धवरम	जिला—पूरबगोदवरी			
गांव	आर एस नं	हेक्टास	एर्स	सेनटिएर्स	एकर्स	सेंटस
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
बाइबुपल्लि	51-2बी	0	28	5	0	70
	3ए, 3डी					
	52—1पीटी	0	18	0	0	44
	53—ए	0	02	5	0	06
	57-1ए	0	02	5	0	06
	58-4ए					
	58-1बी	0	03	0	0	08
	58-1सी	0	14	5	0	35
	58-2ए 1	0	06	0	0	15
	2बी 2					
	58-2बी 3	0	03	0	0	08
	43-2	0	02	0	0	05
	44-3बी	0	10	5	0	26
	42-ए	0	04	0	0	10
	78-2ए 1	0	14	0	0	34
	3बी 2 }					
	78-6सी	0	03	0	0	07
	76-1बी	0	03	0	0	07
	79-1ए 2	0	03	0	0	07
	77-3ए	0	0	5	0	01
	76-1ए	0	03	0	0	08

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
76-1ए 2 } 1बी 2 } 1सी 1 }		0	08	5	0	21
97-3बी		0	01	0	0	03
96-2बी		0	04	0	0	10
74-1बी		0	17	0	0	42
93-1ए 2		0	05	0	0	12
93-1ए 3		0	05	5	0	13
96-4बी		0	01	0	0	03
96-1ए 2		0	03	0	0	07
96-1बी 2		0	07	5	0	18
96-2बी 1		0	09	5	0	24
97-1ए		0	02	0	0	05
97-3ए 1 } 3बी 2 }		0	08	0	0	20
97-1बी		0	03	0	0	07
97-3बी 1		0	02	0	0	05
97-4बी 1 } 4सी 2 }		0	06	5	0	16
100-2		0	02	0	0	05
99-3सी 1		0	02	0	0	05
		1	08	5	5	13

[सं. ओ. 12016/202/91 ओ. एन. जी. डी. 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 722.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Manepalli-I to G.C.S. Tatipaka in A.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Manepalli-I to G.C.S. Tatipaka

State : Andhra Pradesh

Village : Vadrevopalli

Mandal : Gannavaram

District : East Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hectars	Ares	Centiares	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vadrevopalli	51-2B } 3A, 3D }	0	28	5	0	70

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	52-1 pt	0	18	0	0	44
	53-A	0	02	5	0	06
	57-1A } 58-4A }	0	02	5	0	06
	58-1B	0	03	0	0	08
	581-C	0	14	5	0	35
	58-2A } 2B2 }	0	06	0	0	15
	58-2B3	0	03	0	0	08
	43-2	0	02	0	0	05
	44-3B	0	10	5	0	26
	42-A	0	04	0	0	10
	78-2A1 } 3B2 }	0	14	0	0	34
	78-6C	0	03	0	0	07
	76-1B	0	03	0	0	07
	79-1A2	0	03	0	0	07
	77-3A1	0	0	5	0	01
	76-1A	0	03	0	0	08
	76-1A2 } 1B2 } 1C1 }	0	08	5	0	21
Vadrevupalli	97-3B	0	01	0	0	03
	96-2B	0	04	0	0	10
	74-1B	0	17	0	0	42
	93-1A2	0	05	0	0	12
	93-1A3	0	05	5	0	13
	96-4B	0	01	0	0	03
	96-1A2	0	03	0	0	07
	96-1B2	0	07	5	0	18
	96-2B1	0	09	5	0	24
	97-1A	0	02	0	0	05
	97-3A1 } 3B2 }	0	08	0	0	20
	97-1B	0	03	0	0	07
	97-3D1	0	02	0	0	05
	97-4B1 } 4C2 }	0	06	5	0	16
	100-2	0	02	0	0	05
	99-3C1	0	02	0	0	05
		2	08	5	5	13

[No. O-12016/202/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 723.—जबकि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाईप लाईन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत पेरवलि से पंगिडि तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाईप लाईन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाईप लाईन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा कार्यालय, राजमंदि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधि व्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर ओ यू गैस पाईप लाईन पेरवलि से पंगिडि

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश		जिला : पश्चिम गोदावरी		मंडल : कोव्वूर		
गांव	एस नं.	हेक्टास	एस	सेंटि एस	एकस	सेन्टस
चागलू	429-2	0	20	0	0	50
	435-1	0	15	5	0	38
	434-1	0	05	5	0	14
		0	41	0	1	02

[सं. ओ. 12016/203/91 ओ एन जी डी-4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 723.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Peravali to Pangidi in A.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act,

1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project Rajamundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas pipe line from Peravali to Pangidi

State : Andhra Pradesh		District : West Godavari		Mandal : Kovvuru		
Village	S. No.	Hectares	Ares	Centi-res	Acres	Cents
Chagallu	429-2	0	20	0	0	50
	435-1	0	15	5	0	38
	434-1	0	05	5	0	14
		0	41	0	1	02

[No. O-12016/203/91-ONG-D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. प्रा. 724.—जबकि केन्द्रीय सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाईप लाईन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत चिचिनाडा से जि. सि. एस नरसपुर तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ सलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाईप लाईन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रूचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाईप लाईन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के जि. प्रोजेक्ट भूसेकरणा कार्यालय राजमुद्रि आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यु. गैस पाईप लाईन चिचिनाडा से जि. सी. एस. नरसपुर
विलेज चिनमामिडिपल्लि, मंडल नरसपुर जिला पश्चिम गोदावरी

गांव	आर एस नं.	हेक्टास	एस	सेन्टिएस	एकस	सेंटस
चिनमामिडिपल्लि	84-C	0	06	0	0	15
		0	06	0	0	15

[सं. ओ. 12016/204/91 ओ एन जी. डी -4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 724.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Chinchinada to G.C.S. Narsapur in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this Notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the competent authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Chinchinada to G.C.S. Narsapur

Village : Chinamamidipalli

State : Andhra Pradesh

Mandal : Narsapur

District : West Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hectars	Area	Centi-ares	Acres	Cents
Chinamamidipalli	84-C	0	06	0	0	15
	Total	0	06	0	0	15

[No. O-12016/204/91-ONG-D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 725—जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सर्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाईप लाईन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत जि. सि. एस नरसपुर से जि. सि. एस नगरम तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाईप लाईन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्द्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है।

बनते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिमूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाईप लाईन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के लिए प्रोजेक्ट भूसेकरणा कार्यालय राजमद्रि आन्ध्रप्रदेश में दर्ज करा करता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिब्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

तालिका

आर. ओ. यु गैस पाईप लाइन जि. सि. एस. नरसपुर से जि. सि. एस नगरम

गांव—गोदाडा मंडल—मामिडि कुवुर जिला—पूरब गोंदवरी

गांव	आर एस न०	हकटार्स	एर्स	सेन्टिएर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टरस
गोदाडा	144-बी	0	07	0	0	17
	145-1ए	0	26	5	0	65
	145-1बी	0	06	0	0	15
	143-3	0	01	0	0	03
	145-1सी	0	04	5	0	11
	145-1एफ	0	04	5	0	11
	145-1डी	0	04	0	0	10
	145-1ई	0	10	5	0	26
	149-1	0	07	5	0	19
	149-2	0	03	0	0	08
	149-4	0	07	5	0	18
	150-3बी	0	04	5	0	11
	150-3सी	0	07	5	0	19
	150-4ए/2	0	09	0	0	22
	150-4बी/2	0	06	0		15
	151-2ए	0	14	5	0	35
	153-2बी	0	01	5	0	04
	153-1बी	0	02	0	0	05
		1	27	0	3	14

[सं. ओ. 12016/205/9 ओ एन जी डी -4]

एम मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 725.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from G.C.S. Narsapur to G.C.S. Nagaram in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this Notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the competent authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from G.C.S. Narsapur to G.C.S. Nagaram

Village : Geddada

Mandal : Mamidikururu

District : East Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hectares	Ares	Centi-Ares	Acres	Cents
Geddada	144-B	0	07	0	0	17
	145-1A	0	26	5	0	65
	145-1B	0	06	0	0	15
	145-3	0	01	0	0	03
	145-1C	0	04	5	0	11
	145-1F	0	04	5	0	11
	145-1D	0	04	0	0	10
	145-1E	0	10	5	0	26
	149-1	0	07	5	0	19
	149-2	0	03	0	0	08
	149-A	0	07	5	0	1
	150-3B	0	04	5	0	11
	150-3C	0	07	5	0	19
	150-4A/2	0	09	0	0	22
	150-4B/2	0	06	0	0	15
	151-2A	0	14	5	0	35
	153-2B	0	01	5	0	04
	153-1B	0	02	0	0	05
Total		1	27	0	3	14

[No. O-12016/205/91-ONG-D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. मा. 626.—जब कि केन्द्रीय सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत चिचिनाडा से जि. सि. एस. नरसपुर तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी सूची रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी संक्षेप प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरण कार्यालय, राजमंड्रि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. गयाम पाइप लाइन चिचिनाडा से जि. सि. एस. नरसपुर

विलेज : माधवाइपालेम

मंडल : नरसपुर

जिला : पश्चिम गोदावरी

गांव	आर. एम. नं.	हेक्टेयर्स	एयर्स	सेन्टियर्स	एकर्स	सेन्ट्स
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
माधवाइपालेम	78-2	0	02	0	0	05
	77-1	0	05	5	0	13
	77-2	0	05	0	0	12
	77-3	0	01	5	0	04
	73-1बी	0	16	0	0	40
	72-2	0	18	0	0	44
	68-4बी	0	09	5	0	23
	68-2बी	0	09	5	0	24
	68-5	0	01	0	0	03
	63-2	0	11	5	0	28
	62-2	0	07	0	0	17
	69-1ए	0	04	0	0	10
	69-2ए	0	01	5	0	04
		0	92	0	2	27

[सं. ओ - 12016/206/91 - ओ एन जी डी - 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 726.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Chinchinada to G.C.S. Narsapur in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals 484 GI/92--6

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this Notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the competent authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K.G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Chinchiraua to G.C.S. Narsapur

State : Andhra Pradesh Village : Madhavayipalem Mandal : Narsapur District : West Godavre

Village	R.S. No.	Hectares	Ares	Centi-Ares	Acres	Cents
Madhavayipalem	78-2	0	02	0	0	05
	77-1	0	05	5	0	13
	77-2	0	05	0	0	12
	77-3	0	01	5	0	04
	73-1B	0	16	0	0	40
	72-2	0	18	0	0	44
	68-4B	0	09	5	0	23
	68-2B	0	09	5	0	24
	68-5	0	01	0	0	03
	63-2	0	11	5	0	28
	62-2	0	07	0	0	17
	69-1A	0	04	0	0	10
	69-2A	0	01	5	0	04
Total		0	92	0	2	27

[No. O-12016/206/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. ग्रा. 727.—जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत तणुका से गौतमी सालवेंट्स तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है। और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ मंलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एनद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है :

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रूची रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिमूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति संक्षेप प्राधिकारित तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमुंद्री, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराने समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्विण्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. गैस पाइप लाइन तणुका से गौतमी सालवेंट्स और कोस्टल एग्री इन्डस्ट्रीस
स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश विलेज : चिवातम मंडल : उन्द्राजावरम जिला : पश्चिम गोदावरी

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हेक्टेयर्स	एस.	सेन्टियर्स	एकर्स	सेन्ट्स
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
चिवातम	112-2सी	0	04	0	0	10
	112-2बी	0	01	0	0	03
	112-3	0	07	5	0	18

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	112-4	0	03	5	0	09
	112-5ए	0	00	5	0	01
	109-7	0	01	5	0	04
	113-4	0	03	0	0	07
	109-8	0	03	5	0	09
	113-3	0	03	0	0	07
	113-8	0	00	5	0	01
	113-7	0	06	0	0	15
	108	0	11	5	0	28
	107-5	0	03	5	0	09
	107-3, 6	0	05	0	0	12
	106-2बी	0	05	5	0	13
	107-4	0	00	5	0	01
	106-4बी	0	04	0	0	10
	106-7	0	03	0	0	08
	122-1ए	0	01	0	0	02
	122-1बी	0	05	5	0	13
	122-2, 3ए	0	07	0	0	17
	122-313	0	01	5	0	04
	122	0	01	5	0	04
		0	83	5	2	05

[सं. ओ - 12016/207/91 - ओ एन जी डी - 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 727.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Tanuku to Gowthami Solvents in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Tanuku to Gautami Solvents and Coastal Agro Industries

State : Andhra Pradesh Village : Chivatam Mandal : Undrajavaram District : West Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hectares	Ares	Centi Ares	Acres	Cents
Chivatam	112-2C	0	04	0	0	10
	112-2B	0	01	0	0	03
	112-3	0	07	5	0	18
	112-4	0	03	5	0	09
	112-5A	0	0	5	0	01

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	109-7	0	01	5	0	04
	113-4	0	03	0	0	07
	109-8	0	03	5	0	09
	113-3	0	03	0	0	07
	113-8	0	00	5	0	01
	113-7	0	06	0	0	15
	108	0	11	5	0	28
	107-5	0	03	5	0	09
	107-3, 6	0	05	0	0	12
	106-2B	0	05	5	0	13
	107-4	0	00	5	0	01
	106---4B	0	04	0	0	10
	106-7		03	0	0	08
	122-1A	0	01	0	0	02
	122-1B	0	05	5	0	13
	122-2, 3A	0	07	0	0	17
	122-3B	0	01	5	0	04
	122	0	01	5	0	04
		0	83	5	2	05

[No. O-12016/207/91-ONG. D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 728--जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत तणुकु से गीतमि सालवेन्ट्स तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा विछाया जाना है। और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की संज्ञा की घोषणा करती है :

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रूचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति मक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट भूमेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमुद्रि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराने समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निदिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. आ. यू. गैस पाइप लाइन तणुकु से गीतमि सालवेन्ट्स और कोबेंड एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीस लिमिटेड

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश ग्राम : 'मज्जापुरम' मंडल : तणुकु जिला - पश्चिम गोदावरी

शिव	आर. एम. नं.	हेक्टेयर्स	एर्स	सेन्टयर्स	एकर्स	सेन्ट्स
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
मज्जापुरम	2-5, 6, 8	0	17	0	0	4 2
	1-2, 3, 5	0	07	5	0	18
	1-7	0	02	5	0	06
	1-6	0	03	5	0	09
	1-10	0	0	5	0	01

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
सज्जापुरम (जारी)	1-8ए	0	01	5	0	04
	1-9	0	02	5	0	06
	1-8बी	0	03	0	0	08
	1-11	0	03	5	0	09
	1-12	0	01	0	0	09
	1-13	0	01	0	0	02
	12-1ए	0	01	0	0	02
	12-1बी	0	01	0	0	02
	12-1सी	0	0	5	0	01
	12-2बी	0	01	0	0	02
	12-3 पीटी	0	04	0	0	10
		0	51	0	1	24

[म. अं-12016/208/91-ओ एन जी डी-4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 728.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Tanuku to Gowthami Solvents in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission,

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Tanuku to Gautami Solvents and Coastal Agro Industries Limited

State : Andhra Pradesh Village : Sajjapuram Mandal : Tanuku District : West Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hec-tars	Ares	Centi-ares	Acres	Cents
Sajjapuram	2-5, 6, 8	0	17	0	0	42
	1-2, 3, 5	0	07	5	0	18
	1-7	0	02	5	0	06
	1-6	0	03	5	0	09
	1-10	0	0	5	0	01
	1-8A	0	01	5	0	04
	1-9	0	02	5	0	06
	1-8B	0	03	0	0	08
	1-11	0	03	5	0	09
	1-12	0	01	0	0	02
	1-13	0	01	0	0	02
	12-1A	0	01	0	0	02
	12-1B	0	01	0	0	02
	12-1C	0	0	5	0	01
	12-2B	0	01	0	0	02
	12-3pt.	0	04	0	0	10
		0	51	0	1	24

[No. O-12016/208/91/ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 729.—जब कि केन्द्रीय सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मानेपल्लि-1 से जि. सि. एम. तानिपाका तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोजना का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खंड 3 के उपखंड (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की संज्ञा की घोषणा करती है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमि गन पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग के जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूमेकरणा कार्यालय, राजमंडि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज करते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. आ. यू. गैस पाइप लाइन मानेपल्लि - I से जि. सि. एम. तानिपाका

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश ग्राम, पेदपट्टनम मंडल : मामिडिकूसूरु जिला : पूर्वी गोदावरी

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हेक्टरर्स	एर्स	सेन्टीयर्स	एकर्स	सेन्ट्स
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
पेदपट्टनम	36-1	0	06	0	0	15
	36-2	0	09	0	0	22
	36-3	0	02	5	0	06
	38-1,2	0	23	5	0	58
	39-1 पीटी	0	18	0	0	44
		0	59	0	1	45

[सं. ओ - 12016/209/91 - ओ एन जी डी - 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 729.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Mamepalli-I to G.C.S. Talipaka in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Manepalli - I. to G.C.S. Tatipaka

Village : Pedapatnam state : Andhra Pradesh Mandal : Mamidikuduru District : East Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hec- tars	Ares	Centi- ares	Acres	Cents
Pedapatnam	36-1	0	06	0	0	15
	36-2	0	09	0	0	22
	36-3	0	02	5	0	06
	38-1,2	0	23	5	0	58
	39-1 pt	0	18	0	0	44
Total		0	59	0	1	45

[No. O-12016/209/91-ONG D-4

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 730.—जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि मार्वाजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत मानेपल्लि - I से जि. मि. एम. तातिपाका तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है।

वर्णित कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति मक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल और प्रा. गैस आयोग के, जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूमेकरणा कार्यालय, राजमंदि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. गैस पाइप लाइन मानेपल्लि - I से जि. मि. एम. तातिपाका

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश, विलेज - नगरम मंडल - मामिडिकुदुरु जिला - पूर्वी गोदावरी

गांव	आर. एम. न.	हेक्टेयर्स	एर्स	सेन्टीयर्स	एकड़	सेन्ट्स
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
नगरम	8-2	0	03	0	0	08
	7-5ए, सी	0	05	0	0	12
	6-4ए, 3ए, 5ए	0	09	5	0	24
	7-5बी	0	03	5	0	09

65-5A, 4A, 3A	0	09	5	0	24
29-3	0	17	0	0	42
30-2	0	03	0	0	07
29-2	0	11	5	0	28
168-6B	0	05	5	0	13
168-5B	0	03	0	0	08
168-4B, 4D	0	10	0	0	25
167-4D	0	03	0	0	08
169-1A	0	05	5	0	13
	0	89	0	2	21

[स. ओ - 12016/210/91 - ओ एन जी डी - 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 730.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Manepalli-I to G.C.S. Tatipaka in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Manepalli-I to G.C.S. Tatipaka,

Village : Nagaram State : Andhra Pradesh Mandal : Mamidikuduru District : East Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hec- tars	Ares	Centi Ares	Acres	Cents
Nagaram	8-2	0	03	0	0	08
	7-5A, C	0	05	0	0	12
	6-4A, 3A, 5A	0	09	5	0	24
	7-5B	0	03	5	0	09
	65-5A, 4A, 3A	0	09	5	0	24
	29-3	0	17	0	0	42
	30-2	0	03	0	0	07
	29-2	0	11	5	0	28
	168-6B	0	05	5	0	13
	168-5B	0	03	0	0	08
	168-4B, 4D	0	10	0	0	25
	167-4D	0	03	0	0	08
	169-1A	0	05	5	0	13
	Total	0	89	0	2	21

[No. O-12016/210/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

भा. प्रा. 731—जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत तणुकु से गैतमि तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की मंशा की घोषणा करती है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्रा. गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदि, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

ग्रार ओ य पाइप लाइन तणुकु से गैतमि सोलवेन्टम और कोस्टल आगो इन्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड

स्टेट - आन्ध्र प्रदेश, विलेज - तणुकु मंडल - तणुकु जिला - पुरब गोदावरि

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	दब्बटार्स	एर्स	सेन्टिपर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टस
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
तणुकु	376-ए	0	04	0	0	10
	380-5वी	0	06	0	0	15
	3वी	0	10	5	0	26
	380-1ए	0	01	0	0	02
	379-2बी 2	0	04	0	0	10
	543-5	0	10	0	0	25
	543-2	0	04	0	0	10
	545-2	0	07	5	0	18
	545-6	0	06	0	0	15
	543-1बी	0	04	5	0	11
	543-4	0	03	0	0	08
	545-5	0	05	5	0	14
	545-3	0	03	5	0	09
	545-1ए	0	01	5	0	04
	547-5	0	01	0	0	02
	547-1बी	0	03	0	0	08
	379-1ए	0	0	5	0	01
		0	75	5	1	88

[सं. ओ. - 12016/211/91 - ओ एन जी डी - 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 731.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Tanuku to Gautami in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto :

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Tanuku to Gautami Solvents and Coastal Agro Industries Limited

State : Andhra Pradesh		Villge : Tanuku		Mandal : Tanuku		District : West Godavari	
Village	R.S. No.	Hec-tars	Ares	Cent Ares	Acres	Cents	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Tanuku	376-A	0	04	0	0	10	
	380-5B	0	06	0	0	15	
	3B	0	10	5	0	26	
	380-1A	0	01	0	0	02	
	379-2B	0	04	0	0	10	
	2 }						
	543-5	0	10	0	0	25	
	543-2	0	04	0	0	10	
	545-2	0	07	5	0	18	
	545-6	0	06	0	0	15	
	543-1B	0	04	5	0	11	
	543-4	0	03	0	0	08	
	545-5	0	05	5	0	14	
	545-3	0	03	5	0	09	
	545-1A	0	01	5	0	04	
	547-5	0	01	0	0	02	
	547-1B	0	03	0	0	08	
	379-1A	0	0	5	0	01	
		0	75	5	1	88	

[No. O-12016/211/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 732.—जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत तणुकु में गैतमि तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की आज्ञा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति मक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के. जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदिर, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर. ओ. यू. पाइप लाइन तणुकु से गोतमि सालवेन्टस और कोस्टल एग्री इंडस्ट्रीस लिमिटेड

स्टेट - आन्ध्र प्रदेश विलेज - तणुकु वेमवरम मंडल - तणुकु जिला - पूर्व गोदावरि

गांव	आर. एस. नं.	हैक्टेयर्स	एर्स	सेन्टीयर्स	एकर्स	सेन्टस
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
तणुकु वेमवरम	75/1बी	0	03	5	0	09
	15/4बी	0	07	0	0	17
	75/1ए	0	06	0	0	15
	71/4	0	04	0	0	10
	69/3	0	07	5	0	18
	71/3 }	0	05	5	0	13
	71/2					
	74/2	0	06	0	0	15
	72/1	0	04	5	0	11
	59/1	0	06	0	0	15
	53/2 }	0	19	5	0	48
	53/3 }					
	60/1	0	07	5	0	18
	52/6	0	11	0	0	27
	27/4	0	04	0	0	10
	27/3	0	05	5	0	13
	27/2, 1 बी	0	19	0	0	47
	15/4ए	0	07	5	0	18
	16/1बी	0	02	5	0	06
	4/3	0	0	5	0	01
	16/8ए	0	02	5	0	06
	16/7, 1ए	0	01	0	0	27
	9/4	0	05	5	0	13
	4/5	0	05	5	0	14
	9/5	0	05	5	0	13
	16/4	0	01	5	0	04
	16/8बी	0	02	5	0	06
	9/3	0	01	0	0	02
	4/4	0	04	5	0	11
	4/1	0	08	0	0	20
	4/2	0	03	5	0	09
	2/3	0	0	5	0	01
	68	0	02	5	0	06
	61	0	01	5	0	04
	35	0	01	0	0	03
	18	0	02	0	0	05
		1	85	5	4	55

[सं. ओ - 12016/212/91 - ओ एन जी बी - 4]

एम. मार्टिन, डीस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 732.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Tanuku to Gautami in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appear that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this Notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Tanuku to Gautami Solvents and Coastal Agro Industries Limited

State : Andhra Praesh

Village : Tanuku Vemavaram

Mandal : Tanuku District : West Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hec- tares	Ares	Cent Arcs	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tanuku Vemavaram	75/1B	0	03	5	0	09
	15/4B	0	07	0	0	17
	75/1A	0	06	0	0	15
	71/4	0	04	0	0	10
	69/3	0	07	5	0	18
	71/3 } 71/2 }	0	05	5	0	13
	74/2	0	06	0	0	15
	72/1	0	04	5	0	11
	59/1	0	06	0	0	15
	53/2	0	19	5	0	48
	53/3 } 60/1 }	0	07	5	0	18
	52/6	0	11	0	0	27
	27/4	0	04	0	0	10
	27/3	0	05	5	0	13
	27/2; 1B	0	19	0	0	47
	15/4A	0	07	5	0	18
	16/1B	0	02	5	0	06
	4/3	0	0	5	0	01
	16/8A	0	02	5	0	06
	16/7, 1A	0	11	0	0	27
	9/4	0	05	5	0	13
	4/5	0	05	5	0	14
	9/5	0	05	5	0	13
	16/4	0	01	5	0	04
	16/8B	0	02	5	0	06
	9/3	0	01	0	0	02
	4/4	0	04	5	0	11
	4/1	0	08	0	0	20
	4/2	0	03	5	0	09
	2/3	0	0	5	0	01

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tanuku Vemavaram—Contd.	68	0	02	5	0	06
	61	0	01	5	0	04
	35	0	01	0	0	03
	18	0	02	0	0	05
		1	85	5	4	55

[No. O-12016/212/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 733 :—जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत पेरवलि से कोव्वूर तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उस पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की आज्ञा की घोषणा करती है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रूखि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के.जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूसेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदि, आन्ध्रप्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि वह व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा विधिव्यवसायक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है।

अनुसूची

आर ओ यू गैस पाइप लाइन पेरवलि से कोव्वूर

विलेज : मद्दूर ; मंडल : कोव्वूर

जिला : पूर्व गोदावरी

गांव	आर.एस. नं.	हेक्टार्स	एर्स	सेन्टिएस	एकर्स	सेन्टस
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
मद्दूर	85/4 पी टी	0	09	0	0	22
	85/6 पी टी	0	12	0	0	30
	103/10 पी टी	0	06	0	0	15
	170/1 बी पी टी	0	05	5	0	14
	85/7 पी टी	0	18	0	0	45
	85/8 पी टी	0	0	5	0	01
	88/1 पी टी	0	04	0	0	10
	88/2 पी टी	0	03	0	0	08
	88/5 पी टी	0	0	5	0	01
	87/पी टी	0	18	0	0	45
	102/बी	0	18	5	0	46
	102/ए	0	21	0	0	52

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
महूर- जारी	103/12	0	11	0	0	27
	101/1 ए	0	03	0	0	08
	124/1 ई	0	09	0	0	22
	97/1 पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	97/5 पी टी	0	14	0	0	35
	234/4 बी	0	14	5	0	36
	236/1 पी टी	0	12	0	0	30
	236/2 पी टी	0	08	0	0	20
	100/1 पी टी	0	02	0	0	05
	100/5 पी टी	0	21	0	0	52
	100/3	0	01	0	0	03
	100/4	0	15	0	0	37
	99/1	0	10	5	0	26
	98/बी	0	01	0	0	03
	99/2	0	01	0	0	03
	99/5	0	0	5	5	01
	99/6	0	0	5	0	01
	96/पी टी	0	0	5	0	01
	125/पी टी	0	03	5	0	09
	98/2 ए	0	05	0	0	12
	98/2 बी	0	05	0	0	12
	98/2 सी	0	05	0	0	12
	98/2 डी	0	05	0	0	12
	98/3	0	08	0	0	20
	97/1	0	10	0	0	25
	231/5 ए	0	07	5	0	18
	231/2 बी	0	25	0	0	62
	230/1	0	07	5	0	18
	231/1 ए	0	12	0	0	30
	230/2	0	23	5	0	58
	226/2 ए	0	04	0	0	10
	226/1	0	13	5	0	33
	227/4	0	09	5	0	24
	227/3	0	03	5	0	09
	227/4	0	10	5	0	26
	227/5	0	35	0	0	86
	104/6	0	0	5	0	01
	213/2 ए	0	08	0	0	20
	213/2 बी	0	06	5	0	15
	213/3 पी टी	0	26	5	0	65
	225/1	0	13	0	0	32
	170/1 बी	0	42	0	1	04
	171/1 बी	0	05	5	0	14
	211/पी टी	0	06	0	0	15
	171/1 एपीटी	0	04	0	0	10
	172/1 पी टी	0	11	5	0	29
	172/2 पी टी	0	14	5	0	36

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	180/2 पी टी	0	22	5	0	56
	180/1बी पी टी	0	06	0	0	15
	180/1 सी पी टी	0	06	5	0	16
	180/1 डी पी टी	0	05	5	0	14
	181/1सी पी टी	0	09	5	0	23
	181/2 पी टी	0	18	0	0	45
	181/2 पी टी	0	05	5	0	13
	181/3 पी टी	0	05	5	0	13
	183/पी टी	0	03	0	0	07
	182/पी टी	0	05	5	0	14
	95/पी टी	0	02	5	0	06
	232/9 ए पी टी	0	10	0	0	25
	232/9 ए पी टी	0	05	0	0	12
	232/9 बी पी टी	0	03	5	0	09
	232/9 सी पी पी	0	02	5	0	06
	233/9 सी पी टी	0	07	0	0	17
	232/9 डी	0	03	5	0	09
	234/4 ए	0	05	0	0	12
	236/3 एक	0	19	0	0	47
	220/3 बी	0	01	0	0	02
	220/6 पाटें	0	01	0	0	02
	220/6 पाटें	0	11	0	0	27
		7	33	5	18	12

[सं. ओ.-12016/213/91-ओ एन जी डी-4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेप्टी अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 733.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Peravali to Kovvuru in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this Notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. Gas Pipe Line from Peravali To Kovvur

State : Andhra Pradesh

Village : Maddur

Mandal : Kovvur

District : West Godavari

Village	R.S. No.	Hec-tars	Ares	Centi ares	Acres	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maddur	85/4 pt	0	09	0	0	22
	85/6 pt	0	12		0	30
	103/10 pt	0	06	0	0	15

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maddur—Contd.	170/1B pt	0	05	5	0	14
	85/7 pt	0	18	0	0	45
	85/8 pt	0	0	5	0	01
	88/1 pt	0	04	0	0	10
	88/2 pt	0	03	0	0	08
	88/5 pt	0	0	5	0	01
	87/pt	0	18	0	0	45
	102/B	0	18	5	0	46
	102/A	0	21	0	0	52
	103/12	0	11	0	0	27
	101/1A	0	03	0	0	08
	124/1E	0	09	0	0	22
	97/1 pt	0	02	5	0	06
	97/5 pt	0	14	0	0	35
	234/4B	0	14	5	0	36
	236/1 pt	0	12	0	0	30
	236/2 pt	0	08	0	0	20
	100/1 pt	0	02	0	0	05
	100/5 pt	0	21	0	0	52
	100/3	0	01	0	0	03
	100/4	0	15	0	0	37
	99/1	0	10	5	0	26
	98/1B	0	01	0	0	03
	99/2	0	01	0	0	03
	99/5	0	0	5	0	01
	96/pt	0	0	5	0	01
	99/6	0	0	5	0	01
	128/pt	0	03	5	0	09
	98/2A	0	05	0	0	12
	98/2B	0	05	0	0	12
	98/2C	0	05	0	0	12
	98/2D	0	05	0	0	12
	98/3	0	08	0	0	20
	97/1	0	10	0	0	25
	231/5A	0	07	5	0	18
	231/2B	0	25	0	0	62
	230/1	0	07	5	0	18
	231/1A	0	12	0	0	30
	230/2	0	23	5	0	58
	226/2A	0	04	0	0	10
	226/1	0	13	5	0	33
	227/4	0	09	5	0	24
	227/3	0	03	5	0	09
	227/4	0	10	5	0	26
	227/5	0	35	0	0	86
	104/6	0	0	5	0	01
	213/2A	0	08	0	0	20
	213/2B	0	06	0	0	15
	213/3 pt	0	26	5	0	65
	225/1	0	13	0	0	32

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	170/1B	0	42	0	1	04
	171/1B	0	05	5	0	14
	211/pt	0	06	0	0	15
	171 /1A pt	0	04	0	0	10
	172/1 pt	0	11	5	0	29
	172/2 pt	0	14	5	0	36
	180/2 pt	0	22	5	0	56
	180/1B pt	0	06	0	0	15
	180/1C pt	0	06	5	0	16
	180/1D pt	0	05	5	0	14
	181/1C pt	0	09	5	0	23
	181/2 pt	0	18	0	0	45
	181/2 pt	0	05	5	0	13
	181/3 pt	0	05	5	0	13
	183/pt	0	03,	0	0	07
	182/pt	0	05	5	0	14
	95/pt	0	02	5	0	06
	232/9A pt	0	10	0	0	25
	232/9A pt	0	05	0	0	12
	232/9B pt	0	03	5	0	09
	232/9C pt	0	02	5	0	06
	232/9C pt	0	07	0	0	17
	232/9D	0	03	5	0	09
	234/4A	0	05	0	0	12
	236/3F	0	19	0	0	47
	220/3B	0	01	0	0	02
	220/6 pt	0	01	0	0	02
	220/6 pt	0	11	0	0	27
		7	33	5	18	12

[No. O-12016/213/91-ONG D-4]

M. MARTIN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 734 :- जब कि केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुभव करती है कि सार्वजनिक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ एवं प्राकृतिक गैस लाने के लिए पाइप लाइन परियोजना के अन्तर्गत पेरवलि से तणुकु तक तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जाना है ।

और यह भी अनुभव करती है कि उस कार्य के लिए इसके साथ संलग्न विवरणी में निर्धारित भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करना आवश्यक है ।

अतः पेट्रोलियम एवं खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उम पर प्रयोक्ता का अधिकार ग्रहण करने की अंशा की घोषणा करती है ।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में अपनी रुचि रखने वाला कोई भी व्यक्ति अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर भूमिगत पाइप लाइन बिछाने के विरोध में अपनी आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, के.जि. प्रोजेक्ट, भूमेकरणा, कार्यालय, राजमंदिर, आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दर्ज करा सकता है ।

और ऐसी आपत्ति दर्ज कराते समय किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह विशेष रूप से निर्दिष्ट करना होगा कि यह व्यक्तिगत रूप से याथवा विधिव्यवसायिक के माध्यम से अपना मत प्रस्तुत करना चाहता है ।

अनुसूची

आर ओ यू गैस पाइप लाइन परेवलि से तणुकु

स्टेट : आन्ध्र प्रदेश

बिलेली : तणुकु

मंडल : तणुकु

जिला : पश्चिम गोदावरि

गांव	आर एस नं.	हेक्टास	एर्स	सेन्टस	एकर्स	सेन्टस
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
तणुकु	743-2	0	06	5	0	16
	740-2 बी	0	19	5	0	48
	740-1 बी/ 3 ए	0	08	0	0	20
	740-1 बी/2 ए		09	5	0	24
	7 0-1 बी/1 ए	0	09	5	0	23
	737-1 बी/2 ए	0	14	0	0	34
	73 -2 सी	0	09	5	0	24
	730-2 ए	0	35	0	0	86
	729-2	0	02	5	0	06
	724-2 बी	0	13	0	0	32
	440-1 ए	0	10	5	0	26
	459-2 बी	0	09	5	0	24
	459-1 बी 3	0	16	0	0	40
	461/1 ए/2बी	0	18	5	0	46
	462-2 बी	0	19	5	0	46
	460-2 बी	0	12	0	0	30
	474-2 बी	0	21	5	0	53
	473-3 बी	0	09	5	0	22
	475-7 बी	0	07	0	0	17
	473-1 बी	0	01	5	0	04
	441-2 ए	0	04	5	0	11
	444-2 ए	0	03	0	0	07
	438-2ए	0	17	0	0	42
	439-4 ए	0	12	5	0	31
	439-5 ए	0	12	5	0	31
	437-1 ए2	0	08	0	0	20
	384-5 ए	0	09	5	0	24
	437-1 बी1	0	00	5	0	01
	385-1 बी	0	26	5	0	66
	384-3 बी 2	0	14	5	0	36
	384-2 बी	0	09	5	0	24
	376-2 पी टी	0	39	0	0	96
	361-2	0	14	0	0	34
	359-2 बी	0	07	5	0	19
	356-2 बी	0	10	0	0	25

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
सणकु जारी	351-1 बी	0	20	0	0	50
	351-2 बी	0	22	0	0	54
	348-	0	04	0	0	10
	336-1 बी	0	25	0	0	62
	184-4	0	14	0	0	34
	337-3 बी	0	17	5	0	43
	184-4 बी	0	00	5	0	01
	339-2	0	22	5	0	55
	342-3 बी	0	09	5	0	23
	342-3 बी	0	09	5	0	24
	341-2 बी	0	06	5	0	16
	341-1 बी	0	11	5	0	29
	343-4 बी	0	26	5	0	66
	341-4 बी	0	14	0	0	34
	167-2	0	07	5	0	18
	172-9 बी	0	30	5	0	75
	174-2	0	02	5	0	06
	244-1	0	01	0	0	02
	245-2	0	03	5	0	09
	192-2 बी	0	10	5	0	26
	216-2	0	03	0	0	08
	215-2	0	03	5	0	09
	204-1 बी	0	23	0	0	57
	204-7 बी	0	01	5	0	04
	205-3 बी	0	24	5	0	61
	205-5 बी	0	13	5	0	33
	205-4 बी	0	07	5	0	18
	205-4 बी	0	07	5	0	18
	206-1 पी	0	03	0	0	07
	733-1 बी	0	14	5	0	35
	733-2 बी	0	14	0	0	34
	724-1 बी	0	14	5	0	35
	723-2 बी 3 ए	0	35	0	0	87
	358-2	0	19	0	0	47
	359-1 बी	0	09	5	0	23
	459-3 बी	0	09	5	0	23
	357-1 बी	0	25	5	0	63
	171-2	0	16	0	0	40
	178-2	0	22	0	0	54
	181-2 बी	0	13	0	0	82
	183-1	0	14	0	0	34

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	180-4 सी	0	19	0	0	47
	180-4 बी } 186-1 बी }	0	09	5	0	23
	187-2	0	17	0	0	42
	188-3	0	16	0	0	39
	246-2	0	54	0	1	33
	217-1 बी/ 2 बी	0	32	5	0	81
		11	59	5	28	62

[सं. ओ.-12016/214/91-ओ. एन. जी. डी.-4]

एम. मार्टिन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 734.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Peravali to Tanuku in A.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire that right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the land) Act, 1962 the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, K. G. Project, Rajahmundry (533103).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically where he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. GAS PIPE LINE FROM PERAVALI TO TANUKU

ANDHRA SUGARS LTD. TANUKU
STATE : ANDHRA PRAESH

VILLAGE : TANUKU
MANDAL : TANUKU
DISTRICT : WEST GODAVARY

Village	R.S. No.	Hectars	Ares	Cent Ares	Acers	Cents
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tanuku	743-2	0	06	5	0	16
	740-2B	0	19	5	0	48
	740-1D/3A	0	08	0	0	20
	740 1D					
	2A	0	09	5	0	24
	740-1B	0	09	5	0	23
	1A					
	737 1B	0	14	0	0	34
	2A					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tanuku	734-2C	0	09	5	0	24
	730-2A	0	35	0	0	86
	729-2	0	02	5	0	06
	724-2B	0	13	0	0	32
	440-1A	0	10	5	0	26
	459-2B1	0	09	5	0	24
	1B3	0	16	0	0	40
	461-1A, 2B	0	18	5	0	46
	462-2B	0	18	5	0	46
	460-2B	0	12	0	0	30
	474-2B	0	21	5	0	53
	473-3B	0	09	0	0	22
	475-7B	0	07	0	0	17
	473-1B	0	01	5	0	04
	441-2A	0	04	5	0	11
	444-2	0	03	0	0	07
	438-2A	0	17	0	0	42
	439-4A	0	12	5	0	31
	439-5A	0	12	5	0	31
	437-1A2	0	08	0	0	20
	384-5A	0	09	5	0	24
	437-1B1	0	00	5	0	01
	385-1B	0	26	5	0	66
	384-3B2	0	14	5	0	36
	384-2B	0	09	5	0	24
	376-2PT	0	39	0	0	96
	361-2	0	14	0	0	34
	359-2B	0	07	5	0	19
	356-2B	0	10	0	0	25
	351-1B	0	20	0	0	50
	352-2B	0	22	0	0	54
	348-	0	04	0	0	10
	336-1B	0	25	0	0	62
	185-4	0	14	0	0	34
	337-3B	0	17	5	0	43
	184-4B	0	00	5	0	01
	339-2	0	22	5	0	55
	342-3B	0	09	5	0	23
	342-3B	0	09	5	0	24
	341-2B	0	06	5	0	16
	341-1B	0	11	5	0	29
	343-4B	0	26	5	0	66
	341-4B	0	14	0	0	34
	167-2	0	07	5	0	18
	172-9B	0	30	5	0	75
	174-2	0	02	5	0	06
	244-1	0	01	0	0	07
	245-2	0	03	5	0	09
	192-2B	0	10	5	0	26
	216-2	0	03	0	0	08

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Tanuku	215-2	0	03	5	0	09
	204-1B	0	23	0	0	57
	204-7B } 205-3B }	0	01	5	0	04
		0	24	5	0	61
	205-5B	0	13	5	0	33
	205-4B	0	07	5	0	18
	205-4B	0	07	5	0	18
	206-1P	0	03	0	0	07
	733-1B	0	14	5	0	35
	733-2B	0	14	0	0	34
	724-1B	0	14	5	0	35
	723-2B } 3A }	0	35	0	0	87
	358-2	0	19	0	0	47
	359-1B } 459-3B }	0	09	5	0	23
		0	09	5	0	23
	357-1B	0	25	5	0	63
	171-2	0	16	0	0	40
	178-2	0	22	0	0	54
	181-2B	0	33	0	0	82
	183-1	0	14	0	0	34
	180-4C	0	19	0	0	47
	180-4B } 186-1B }	0	09	5	0	23
	187-2	0	17	0	0	42
	188-3	0	16	0	0	39
	246-2	0	54	0	1	33
	217-1B } 2B }	0	32	5	0	81
		11	59	5	28	62

[No. O-12016/214/91-ONG—D-4]
M. MART IN, Desk Office1

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1992

का.प्र. 735—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पदार्थ-लाभन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) को धारा 2 के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.प्र. 1778 तारीख 13 जुलाई, 1989 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 5 अगस्त, 1989 में प्रकाशित की गई थी को, उन बातों के सिवाय अधिक्रांत करते हुए, जिन्हें ऐसे अधिक्रमण से पहले किया गया है या करने का लोप किया गया है नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में वर्णित प्राधिकारी को इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन के मथुरा-झालन्धर उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना के लिए उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में की तत्स्थानों प्रविष्टि में वर्णित क्षेत्रों के भीतर सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

सारणी

प्राधिकारी का पता	क्षेत्राधिकार
श्री एस. बी. भट्टाचार्य, अपेक्ष पाइपलाइन इंजीनियर, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मथुरा-झालन्धर पाइपलाइन, नजफगढ़ रोड, बिजवासन, नई दिल्ली-110061	उत्तर प्रदेश, हरियाणा, पंजाब राज्य और दिल्ली संघ राज्य क्षेत्र।

[सं० ओ-25023/72/87-ओ.प्र.प्र.आई.]

कुलदीप सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1992

S.O. 735.—In exercise of the power conferred by clause (a) of section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum No. SO 1778, dated the 13th July, 1989, published in the Gazette of India, dated the 5th August, 1989, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby authorises the authority mentioned in column 1 of the Table below to perform the functions of the competent authority for Mathura-Jullundur-Product Pipeline Project of the Indian Oil Corporation under the said Act, within the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column 2 of the said Table.

TABLE

Address of the Authority	Area of Jurisdiction
Shri S. B. Bhattacharjee, Senior Pipeline Engineer, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Mathura-Jalandhar Pipeline, Najafgarh Road, Bijwasan, New Delhi-110061.	State of Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab and Union Territory of Delhi.

[No. O-25023/72/87-OR-I]
KULDIP SINGH, Under S. cy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1992

सारणी

का.आ. 736.—केंद्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रबल शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 3473 तारीख 7 दिसम्बर, 1987 जो भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 19 दिसम्बर, 1987 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, को उन बातों के सिवाय अधिकृत करते हुए, जिन्हें ऐसे अधिकरण से पहले किया गया है या करने का गोप किया गया है नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में वर्णित प्राधिकारी को इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन के हल्दिया-मौरीग्राम-राजबंद-बरोनी पाइपलाइन परियोजना के लिए उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 की तरफ़ामी प्रविष्टि में वर्णित क्षेत्रों के भीतर सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

प्राधिकारी का पता	क्षेत्राधिकार
श्री एम. प्रार. सेन, उप प्रबंधक (संक्रिया), इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, हल्दिया-मौरीग्राम-राजबंद-बरोनी पाइपलाइन, डा. दोलया-अंडुल मौरी, मौरीग्राम, जिला हावड़ा-711302	पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य

[सं. ओ-25023/72/87-ओ.आर.आई]
कुलदीप सिंह, अधीन सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1992

S.O. 736.—In exercise of the power conferred by clause (a) of section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O. No. 3473, dated the 7th December, 1987, published in the Gazette of India, dated the 19th December, 1987, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby authorises the authority mentioned in Column 1 of the Table below to perform the functions of the Competent Authority for Haldia-Mourigram-Rajbandh-Barauni Pipeline of the Indian Oil Corporation Limited under the said Act, within the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in Column 2 of the said Table.

TABLE

Authority & Address

Area

Shri S.R. Sen,
Deputy Manager (Operations),
Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
Haldia-Mourigram-Rajbandh-Barauni Pipelines,
PO: Dollya-Andul-Mouri,
Mourigram
Distt. Howrah-711302.

State of West Bengal.

[No. O-25023/72/87-OR-I]
KULDIP SINGH, Under Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1992

का.शा. 737.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कैंतरा बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके मंकारों के बीच, प्रयुक्त में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. 2, बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/116/85-डी-2(ए)]
वी. के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 737.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Mgt. of Canara Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-2-1992.

[No. L-12012/116/85-D. II(A)]
V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer.
ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, AT BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri P. D. Apshankar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/20 of 1986

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Canara Bank.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :—

For the Employer : Shri R. S. Pal, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri V. T. Mirajkar, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Banking.

STATE : Maharashtra.

Bombay, the 29th January, 1992

AWARD PART—II

The Central Government by their order No. L-12012, 116/85-D. II(A), dated 26-5-1986 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in terminating the services of Shri J. B. Chavan, Peon, Thane (Main Branch) with effect from 18-5-1984 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?”

2. The necessary Issues were framed at Ex. 4. The Issue No. 2 was tried as a preliminary Issue. By the Award Part—I passed on 12-1-1990, it was held that the domestic enquiry held against the workman concerned was held properly and fairly and the rules of natural justice were properly followed. Issue No. 2 was found accordingly.

3. Rest of the Issues are thus :—

1. Is it proved that the workman Shri J. B. Chavan assaulted the co-worker Shri R. B. Gujar, and misbehaved on the noon of 21-6-1983, as alleged by the Bank in its written statement para 1 ?
2. Whether the worker did not file any appeal against the findings given by the Inquiry Officer under the service Rules ? If so, what is its effect on the termination of the worker's service ?
3. Whether the action of the management of the Bank in terminating the services of the said worker with effect from 18-5-1984 is just and proper ?
4. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?
5. What Award ?

4. My findings on the said Issues are :—

1. Yes.
3. Yes, the findings of the Enquiry Officer stand.
4. Yes.
5. Nil.
6. Award, as per award below.

REASONS

5. After the Award Part-I was passed as above, the workman Shri J. B. Chavan filed his affidavit regarding his case on the rest of the Issues, and he was cross examined on behalf of the Bank management. No oral evidence was led on behalf of the Bank on the rest of the Issues.

6. The charge framed against the workman by the General Manager of the Bank on 29-6-1983 in substance was thus :—

“On the noon of 21-6-1983 at about 4.30 p.m. when the Branch Manager Shri I. J. Rao was leaving the Bank at Thane by the rear side of the door, Shri R. B. Gujar, the Peon working in the Mumbra Branch of the Bank, stopped the said Branch manager and complained to him that the workman Shri Chavan, who was then working as a Peon at Thane Main Branch, had assaulted him with a transfer date stamp. Thereafter the workman Shri Chavan started beating Shri Gujar and used abused words.

The workman Shri Chavan snatched the Bank's umbrella from the hands of Shri Gujaré, and started beating him with it. The Branch manager Shri Rao returned to the Bank. The workman Shri Chavan told the Branch Manager Shri Rao in harsh language that in case he would take cognizance of the said incident and would report the matter with the higher authorities, he would have to face the dire consequences. Thereafter, the workman caught hold of Shri Gujaré by his neck inside the Bank's premises and drove him to the rear door of the Bank's premises and pushed him out. He further said that he did not care for the Bank's job. By the said action, the workman Shri Chavan committed an act of riotous and disorderly behaviour in the premises of the Bank and thus acted in a manner prejudicial to the interest of the Bank and thus committed gross misconduct under clauses (k) and (m) of the Regulation 3 under chapter XI of the Canara Bank Service Rules."

7. The necessary domestic enquiry was held against the workman Shri Chavan regarding the said alleged gross misconduct on his part, and as noted above it was held to be fairly and properly conducted and the rules of natural justice being followed. The enquiry was held by Shri D. V. Shukla, the Bank Officer. It is seen from the original enquiry proceedings that two witnesses viz. the Branch Manager Shri J. J. Rao, and the peon Shri R. B. Gujaré alleged to be assaulted by the said workman Shri Chavan, were examined on behalf of the Bank management. They were cross examined by the defence representative of the workman. Thereafter the defence representative made a certain statement regarding the case of the workman. Thereafter the workman's witness Shri Bhatevadkar was examined, and the Enquiry Officer put some questions to him. Thereafter the workman's representative filed his arguments in writing before the Enquiry Officer, and the Enquiry Officer submitted his enquiry report to the Bank Management. The Bank's above said witnesses deposed about the incident in question before the Enquiry Officer. I have gone through the report of the Enquiry Officer. I find that he had considered all the points raised by the defence representative in his report. The complaint filed by Shri Gujaré dated 21-6-1983 about his assault by the workman Shri Chavan with the Deputy General Manager was produced before the Enquiry Officer. The Medical Report dated 21-6-1983 issued by the Medical Officer of the General Hospital, Thane, stating that the abrasions were noticed on different parts of the body of Shri Gujaré, was also produced before the Enquiry Officer. On going through the report of the Enquiry Officer, I find that the Enquiry Officer had properly considered the oral and documentary evidence placed before him, and as such, his findings are quite just and proper, and are not in any way perverse. Therefore, the finding on Issue No. 1 must be recorded by this Tribunal and is recorded that the workman Shri Chavan had assaulted the co-worker Shri R. B. Gujaré on the noon of 21-6-1983 and had misbehaved, as alleged by the Bank management. Issue No. 1 is found in the affirmative.

ISSUE NO. 3

8. Admittedly the workman did not file any appeal against the findings of the Enquiry Officer, even though he was entitled under the Service Rules of the Bank to file such an appeal. Therefore as he did not file any appeal challenging the findings of the Enquiry Officer, the findings of the Enquiry Officer recorded against the said workman stand. Issue No. 3 is found accordingly.

ISSUE NOS. 4 and 5

9. As the said workman had assaulted the co-worker as above, and as such had committed gross misconduct as contemplated under clauses (k) and (m) of Regulation 3 of Chapter XI of the Canara Bank Service Code, the action of the Bank management in discharging him from service must be said to be quite just and proper. The workman has relied upon a number of cases of the High Courts and the Supreme Court in his Written Arguments. However, they do not apply to the facts of the present case. On the contrary, reliance was placed by the Bank management upon the following two cases of the Supreme Court, which are material.

484 GI/92—9

10. In the case reported in 1964 II LLJ P. 113 (Tata Oil Mills V/s. its workmen) of the Supreme Court, it was held thus :—

The relevant Standing Orders of the Factory provided that drunkenness or riotous or disorderly behaviour or indecent behaviour within or without the factory would be a misconduct. A workman was found to have assaulted outside the factory another workman, as the latter was in favour of introduction of incentive bonus scheme which was opposed by the former workman and his colleagues. It was held that the conduct of the workman in assaulting the other workman for the reason that the latter was supporting the plea of more production was within the purview of misconduct under the relevant standing orders.

11. In the other case of the Supreme Court reported in 1975 I LLJ P. 391 (Munchandani Electronics and Radio Industries Ltd. V/s. its workmen) it was held that an act wherever committed, inside or outside the premises of an establishment, if it has the effect of subverting the discipline or good behaviour within the premises or precincts of the establishment, will amount to misconduct under the concerned standing orders.

12. In the case reported in 1990 LIC P. 1325 the Allahabad High Court held that assaulting a co-worker is a serious misconduct justifying the punishment of dismissal. Similarly, the Kerala High Court in the case reported in 1990 II CIR P. 165 held that the termination on the ground of assaulting the employees of the Company is fully justified. Therefore, in view of the assault of the workman in question in the present case upon his colleague amounts to gross misconduct on his part, and the order of termination of his service by the Bank management is quite justified.

13. Clause 3 (k) and (m) of Regulation 3 of the Canara Bank Service Code state that drunkenness or riotous or disorderly behaviour or indecent behaviour in the premises of the Bank, or committing any act which is prejudicial to the interest of the Bank, amount to misconduct. In the present case the workman in question by assaulting his colleague has committed a misconduct as contemplated under the provisions of the Canara Bank Service Code. Therefore, the action of the Bank in question is justified. Issue No. 4 is found in the affirmative. As such, the said workman is entitled to no relief. Issue No. 5 is found accordingly.

14. The following Award is, therefore, passed.

AWARD

The action of the management of Canara Bank in terminating the services of Shri J. B. Chavan, Peon, Thane (Main Branch) with effect from 18-5-1984 is just and proper.

The parties to bear their own costs of this reference.

Dated : 29-01-1992.

P. D. APSHANKAR, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1992

का.भा. 738.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 7-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-12012/231/89-डी 2 (ए)]

बी. क. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 738.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Mgt. of Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-2-1992.

[No. L-12012/231/89-D. II(A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARJAN DEV PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 89 of 1990

In the matter of dispute :

BETWEEN

Shri Rajesh Kumar Saini C/o. R. S. Saini Ganj Morada-
bad Branch, Unnao.

AND

The Regional Manager, Bank of India, Civil Lines,
Kanpur.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its Notification No. L-12012/231/89-D. 2(A), dated 21-3-1990 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

Whether the action of the management of Bank of India Kanpur in terminating the services of Shri Rajesh Kumar Saini is justified? If not to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. In this case reference order was received on 25-3-1990 whereupon 19-4-1990 was fixed for filing of claim statement. Since then no claim statement has been filed. On 21-5-91 Km. Neeta Mathur auth. representative for the workman moved an application for time to file statement of claim which was allowed and time till 21-6-91 was granted. Again on 21-6-91 another application was moved by the authorised representative for the workman for time without giving sufficient reasons. Thus from the above it can be safely inferred that the workman is not at all interested in the dispute raised.

3. Therefore, from the facts and circumstances stated above a no claim award is given in the case..

4. Reference is answered accordingly.

Dated : 15-1-1992.

ARJAN DEV, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1992

का.प्र. 739.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधि-करण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-17012/27/90-आई.अ.र. (बी.आई.)]

बी. के. वेंकट, अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 739.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Life Insurance Corporation of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-2-92.

[No. L-17012/27/90-IR(BI)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI ARJAN DEV PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR, U.P.

Industrial Dispute No. 155 of 1990

Sri K. N. Soni,
Executive Committee
Central National Life Insurance Employees Association,
118/78, Kaushalpur, Kanpur.
And

Secretary,
Account Audit Section,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
16/98, Mahatma Gandhi Marg,
Kanpur.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its notification No. L-17012/27/90 I.R. (B-I) dated 12-7-90, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:—

Kya Sewayojako dwara Sri K. K. Yadav Sahayak ke virudha sachiv audit tatha nirikshan vibhag Bhartiya Jiwan Bima Nigam Kanpur dwara censure karne ki karyawahi nyaysangat hai? Yadi nahi to karamkar kis anutosh ke haqdar hai?

2. The industrial dispute on behalf of the workman Sri K. K. Yadav, has been raised by Central National Life Insurance Employees Association (hereinafter referred to as Association). In this case, on 9-12-91 an application was moved by the workman with the prayer to close the case. Since the application was not signed by any office bearer of the Association it was ordered to be put up for further orders. On 24-1-92 Sri K. N. Soni who is the member of the Executive Committee of the Association has raised the dispute as ordered and has signed the said application. In the application it is alleged that on the basis of legal advice it has been decided to withdraw the case.

3. In view of the said application there is nothing left in the case and accordingly while allowing the application I decide the reference in favour of the management and against the Association.

4. Reference is answered accordingly.

Dated : 24-1-1992

ARJAN DEV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1992

का.प्र. 740.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार लक्ष्मी कार्मशियल बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधि-करण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-12012/39/84-डी-4 (ए)]

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 740.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Laxmi Commercial Bank Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-2-92.

[No. L-12012/39/84 D.IV(A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI GANPATI SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 26/85

In the matter of dispute

Shri Moti Ram, C/o Shri K. M. Sharma,
Branch Manger, Delhi State Co-operative Bank Ltd.,
Mehrauli Branch, Mehrauli, New Delhi.

Versus

The Assistant General Manager,
Laxmi Commercial Bank Ltd.
Shila Hotel Building,
Ram Nagar, New Delhi.

APPEARANCES : None—for the workman.

Shri N. C. Sikri with Shri V. K. Rao—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its order No. L-12012/39/84-D.IV(A) dated 17th June, 85 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Laxmi Commercial Bank Ltd., New Delhi in not confirming in Bank's services Shri Moti Ram, Sub Staff is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. Management evidence in this case was recorded on 6-8-91 and the case was fixed for filing of affidavit by the workman in support of his evidence. None appeared on behalf of workman on 17-9-91 nor on 10-12-91 and nor on 14-1-92. It appears that the workman was not interested in proceeding further with this dispute. I, therefore, pass No Dispute award in this case, and leave the parties to bear their own costs.

14th January, 1992.

GANPATI SHARMA, Presiding Officer

का.भा. 741.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/235/90-डी-2 (ए)]

वी० के० वेणुगोपालन डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 741.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-2-92.

[No. L-12012/235/90-IR (B-II)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI GANPATI SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 145/90

BETWEEN

In the matter of dispute between
Shri N D. Mongia, through,
The General Secretary,
Punjab National Bank,
Employees Union (Delhi).
N-8, Green Park, New Delhi.

Versus

The Chairman,
Punjab National Bank,
Head Office,
Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi.

2. The Regional Manager,
Punjab National Bank,
Delhi Region,
F-14, Competent House,
Connaught Place, New Delhi-1.

APPEARANCES:

Shri V. K. Gupta—for the workman.
Miss Anajli Saxena—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/235/90-I.R. (B-II) dated 21-12-90 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank in imposing the penalty of reducing pay of Shri N D. Mongia to one lower stage for a period of one year and recovering the amount of Rs. 14000 from the workman is justified ? If not to what relief is the workman entitled ?"

2. In this dispute workman representative Shri V. K. Gupta made statement that the dispute has been amicably settled and wanted to withdraw his case with the request that no dispute award may be passed. In view of the statement of the representative for the workman No Dispute exist between the parties and I, therefore, pass No Dispute award in this case leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

28th January, 1992.

GANPATI SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली 12 फरवरी, 1992

का.भा. 742.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब एंड सिन्ध बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12011/3/91-आई आर बी-II]

वी० के० वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 742.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab & Sind Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-2-92.

[No. L-12011/3/91-IR (B-II)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI GANPATI SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 93/91

In the matter of dispute
Shri J. S. Rosha & three others through,
The General Secretary,
Punjab & Sind Bank, Staff Union (Delhi),
E-3, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.

Versus

Zonal Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank,
18/19, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.

APPEARANCES:

None—for the workman.

None—for the management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12011/3/91-I.R.B-2 dated 22-7-91 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab & Sind Bank in deducting one day's wages from the salary of Shri J. S. Rosha, M. P. Singh Sathad, Harpal Singh and Kundan Singh for absence from duty for a shortwhile is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled ?"

2 Notices were sent to the workmen by registered post as well as by dasti service at the address four times but none has appeared in this reference. It appears that they are not interested in proceeding further with this dispute and I, therefore, pass a No Dispute award in this case and leave the parties to bear their own costs.
13th January, 1992.

GANPATI SHARMA, Presiding Officer

का.प्र. 743.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/42/91-आईडी-2 (ए)]

S.O. 743.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Bank of Maharashtra and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-2-92.

[No. L-12012/142/91-IR (B-II)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI GANPATI SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 100/91

In the matter of dispute :

BETWEEN

Shri S. K. Jain through,
General Secretary, Mahabank Karamchari Sangh
(Regd.)
898, Nai Sarak, Delhi-110006.

Versus

The General Manager, Bank of Maharashtra, North Zone,
6/30-31, W.E.A., Karolbagh,
New Delhi.

APPEARANCES:

Shri R. K. Kadam—for the workman.
Shri Anand Narayan Clerk of—the Management

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/142/91-I.R. B-2 dated nil has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of Maharashtra not to promote Shri S. K. Jain who has qualified in the typing test and senior most is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?”

2. The case was fixed today for filing of claim by the workman when his representative made the statement that his dispute has since been adjudicated by the Hon'ble High Court and no dispute is now left between him and the Management. He further stated that in view of this adjudication by the Hon'ble High Court a No Dispute award may be passed in this case.

3. In view of the statement of the representative for the workman no dispute exist between the parties as the same has since been adjudicated upon by the Hon'ble High Court and accepted by the parties. A No Dispute award is, therefore, given in this reference. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

GANPATI SHARMA, Presiding Officer

Dated : 5-12-1992

का.प्र. 744.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/47/89-डी-2 (ए)]

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 744.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-2-92.

[No. L-12012/47/89-D.II(A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, AT BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri P. D. Apshankar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/30 of 1989

PARTIES :

The Employers in relation to the Management of Bank of India

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer—Shri Thomas Varghese, and Shri N. L. Khedekar, Officers of the Bank.

For the Workmen—Shri S. S. Kantak, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Banking

STATE : Goa.

Bombay, dated the 29th January, 1992

AWARD

The Central Government by their order No. L-12012/47/89-D.II (A) dated 18-08-1989 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the action of the Management of Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Subhash V. Naik is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The case of the workman Shri Subhash V. Naik, as disclosed from the statement of claim (Ex. W-2) filed by him in person, in short, is thus :—

He was employed in the service of the Bank at Goa as a Budlee Sepoy and his services were utilised by the Bank from September, 1983 to November, 1985. Before the termination of his services, no notice was given to him by the Bank management, nor was he paid any retrenchment compensation. During the said period of September, 1983 to November, 1985 he worked at the different branches of the Bank, namely, Panaji, Campal, Miramar Taleigao, and Porovorum, and worked for a total period of 515 days as follows :—

Year 1983 (from September)	74 days
Year 1984	253 days
Year 1985 (upto November)	188 days
Total	515 days

The Bank did not comply with the provisions of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

before terminating his services in November, 1985. In 1982 an understanding was reached between the Bank and the Bank of India Employees' Union that all Budlee Sepoys who had completed 240 days in a span of 12 consecutive months would be absorbed as regular sub-staff. Accordingly the Budlee Sepoys in Goa were taken into permanent service of the Bank. There was a further agreement between the Bank and the Union dated 1-2-1988, Clause No. 1 of that agreement dealt with the absorption of the Budlee Sepoys who had completed 240 days as on 1-2-1988. Clause 3 stated that those Budlee Sepoys who had not completed 240 days shall be continued on panel and shall be engaged on 'need basis'. Therefore, even assuming that the said workman had not completed 240 days in the year, still as per the clause 3 of the said settlement he should have been continued to be engaged by the Bank. However, as he had completed 240 days, he ought have been dealt with by the Bank as per clause 1 or 2 of the said agreement. The termination of the services of the workman by the Bank management is bad-in-law, and therefore, the workman lastly prayed that the Bank management be directed to reinstate him in service.

3. The Deputy Zonal Manager, Bombay, of the said Bank by his written statement (Ex. M-3) opposed the said claim of the workman, and in substance contended thus :—

The Bank had engaged the services of the workman Shri S. V. Naik who had worked intermittently at the Panaji Branch of the Bank from 1983 to 1985. His services were engaged in accordance with clause 20.7(c) of the first Bi-Partite Settlement of 1966. As per the circular dated 24-10-1983, clause C, those Budlee Sepoys who are not sponsored by the Employment Exchange and who had worked for 90 days or more but less than 240 days, would be administered to a written test. The clause (d) stated that the candidates who failed in the written test and were not sponsored by the Employment Exchange, were not to be continued as Budlee Sepoys. As the said workman had not worked for 90 days in the year 1983, he was not eligible for administering for the written test held on 26-2-1984. Further, as his name was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange in 1983, he could not have been continued in service as a Budlee Sepoy. However, on humanitarian grounds his services were utilised till November, 1985. But in November, 1985 when a fresh list of Budlee Sepoys was prepared, the Bank found that the name of the said workman was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange, and hence the Bank could not include his name in that list for the above said reasons.

4. The management further contended thus :—

As the services of the temporary employees are terminated at the end of a specific temporary period, no notice of the termination is required to be given to him. Further, such employees are not entitled to retrenchment compensation. As the said workman had not put in one year's continuous service, no notice was required to be given to him before terminating his service, and he was also not entitled to any retrenchment compensation. The said workman had worked for 365 days only during the period from 1983 to 1985, and not for 515 days as alleged by the workman. He worked as follows :—

Year 1983 (September to December)	59 days
Year 1984 (January to December)	197 days
Year 1985 (January to November)	109 days
Total	365 days

The said workman used to be engaged for certain specific period with break at the regular intervals. It is not true that the Bank had taken into perma-

nent service all the budlee sepoys who had completed 240 days of service, as alleged by the workman. Those workmen who had worked for 240 days or more in a span of 12 consecutive months and continued to be engaged, were only absorbed as permanent sub-staff in November, 1985. As the said workman was not on the approved panel, the said workman was discontinued from service in 1985. The name of the said workman was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange in 1985 when a fresh panel of Budlee Sepoys were prepared by the Bank. Thereafter, when his name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange in 1987, the Government had put a complete ban on recruitment. The services of the workman were terminated in accordance with the Bank's procedure and as per law.

The Bank management, therefore, lastly prayed that this Tribunal should uphold their action in question, and should reject the prayed of the said workman.

5. The Issues framed at Exh. 4 are :—

- (1) Whether the termination of the services of the workman Shri S. V. Naik by the Bank is in contravention of the provisions contained in Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
- (2) Whether the said workman had completed 240 days work during a period of 12 consecutive months?
- (3) Whether the action of the management of Bank of India in terminating the services of the workman Shri S. V. Naik is justified?
- (4) If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?
- (5) What Award?

6. My findings on the said Issues are :—

- (1) Issues does not survive.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Nil.
- (5) Award as per below.

REASONS

Issue Nos. : 1 and 2

7. The workman Shri Subhash V. Naik filed his affidavit in support of his case at Ex. W12, and he was cross examined on behalf of the Bank management, Shri R. J. Nayak, the Deputy Regional Manager of the Panaji Region, filed his affidavit (Ex. M/14) in support of the Bank's case, and he was cross examined on behalf of the workman. The Bank's witness Shri Nayak in substance stated in his affidavit thus:—

The said workman Shri Subhash V. Naik was engaged in the Bank's service as a Budlee Sepoy intermittently for 385 days at Panaji Branch, and he was engaged for a few days at some other branches. He was engaged for a total period of 385 days during the period of 8-9-1983 to 28-11-1985 intermittently. He was paid the wages for the number of days he was engaged and his wages were deposited in his S.B. Account No. 8856, opened for this purpose at Panaji Branch. He was given regular break in his engagement as Budlee Sepoy on week days, and hence he was paid the wages for Sundays and Holidays. A break was generally given for about 3 to 4 days as per the requirement of the Bank management, and he was not engaged continuously for 30 days in a month on any occasion. He was not engaged for 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months. The name of the said workman was not sponsored by the Regional Employment Exchange, and he had not completed 90 days of service in 1983, and as such he was not eligible to appear for the written test held on 26-2-1984 and also for the empanelment as a Budlee Sepoy which was prepared in 1984. His

name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange in 1987, and by that time the Government of India had put a complete ban on the recruitment of sub-staff cadre in the Banks.

8. In his cross examination the said witness of the Bank management stated thus:—

As the said workman's name was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange, and he had not completed 90 days' service in 1983, his name was not placed on the panel of Budlee Sepoys. However, his services were utilised by the Bank till 1985. As he was not on the approved panel, this was contrary to the instructions from the Bank, by the Panaji Branch. In case a workman works from 1st to 10th in a month, he is paid the wages for Sunday also of that period. The workman had worked for 385 days in the Bank not continuously, but intermittently.

9. The said workman in substance stated in his affidavit thus:—

He worked for a total period of 515 days in different branches of the Bank. This number of 515 days includes Sundays. He cannot state the exact number of days worked by him at any particular branch. He also cannot state the number of Sundays counted by him for his service. He worked for a total period of 365 days at Panaji Branch during the period from 8-9-1983 to 28-11-1985. The Bank used to maintain an attendance book for the Budlee Sepoys, and he has put his signatures in that book wherever, and whenever he was engaged. He had completed 240 days, service in a block of 12 continuous months.

10. In his cross examination, the said workman stated, and admitted thus—

There were some breaks in his service from September, 1983 to November, 1985. The Break used to be after the service of one month. However, he does not remember in which month he worked for 30 days continuously. In case there were Sundays and holidays during the continuous period of his work, he was paid the wages for those Sundays, and holidays. His name was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange. He was taken directly in the Bank's service in 1983. He had not appeared for any written test of the Bank management. He cannot state during what continuous period of 12 months, he worked for 240 days.

11. I find that the evidence of the Bank management is supported by the documentary evidence on record, and as such, I accept the evidence of the Bank's witness. I find that the workman had not completed 240 days' service in a continuous period of 12 months.

12. The documentary evidence on record is thus:—

Ex. W-5 is a letter dated 10-3-1983 issued by the Zonal Manager of the Bank to all Branch managers of the Bank. This letter stated that the monthly breaks must be given to the temporary sub-staff members, that they are entitled to the wages for Sundays, only if they work from Monday to Saturday. In case they remain absent for a day during the week, they are not entitled to the wages of Sunday in that week, or for a Bank holiday.

Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, states that no employer or workman or Trade Union shall commit any unfair labour practice. The 5th schedule of the said Act enumerated the unfair labour practices.

To employ workmen as 'Badlis' casually or temporaries and to continue them as such for years, with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen"

is one of the unfair labour practices on the part of the employer. Therefore, according to the workman, by issuing the letter as above, the Bank management had indulged in an unfair labour practice. However, the other documentary evidence, i.e. the letter dated 30-11-1987 (Ex. W-7) sent by the Regional Manager of the Bank to the said workman, is important. By this letter the Bank management had informed the workman that his name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange, Panaji, Goa, for the post of Budlee Sub-staff, and that he should come to the Office of the Bank management and collect the necessary application form for the said post. It is thus quite clear from the said letter of the Bank management that the Bank management had not indulged in any unfair labour practice relating to the workman.

Ex. M-10 is a Xerox copy of the attendance record concerning to the said workman Shri Subhash V. Nark of the period from September, 1983 to November, 1985. The workman had put his signatures for days he had attended for his work.

Ex. M-11 is a copy of the register showing that the amount of wages were paid by the Bank into the Account No. 8856 of the said workman. The amounts were paid of the days on which he had worked. The above said Bank witness stated in his evidence that the said workman had worked only for a total period of 385 days during the period from September, 1983 to November, 1985. This statement of the Bank's witness is supported by the abovesaid documentary evidence on record. The workman has not produced any documentary evidence to show that he had worked for a total number of 315 days during the period of 2 years. Therefore, I accept the evidence led on behalf of the Bank management, and find that the said workman had not worked for 240 days during a period of 12 consecutive months, and as such, he was not entitled to one month's wages in lieu of notice, or to the retrenchment compensation, as claimed by him.

13. According to the workman, even assuming that he had worked for only 385 days during the period from September, 1983 to November, 1985, the number of Sundays must be added to that figure, and as such, it will be seen that he had worked for more than 240 days during a continuous period of 12 months. Section 25B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, lays down that a workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period of 12 calendar months preceding the date with reference to which the calculation of wages is made has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days. Thus it is necessary that the workman must have actually worked under the employer for 240 days. It means that the workman must have been worked on Sundays and has been paid the wages for Sundays, or he must have been placed under the control of the employer for the purpose of calculation of the wages for Sunday. According to the workman, he has been paid the wages whenever he worked on Sundays. I, therefore, find that the said total number of days, i.e. 385 days include Sundays and holidays for which he was paid by the Bank management.

14. According to the above said Bank's witness, the name of the said workman was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange, he had not completed 90 days' service in 1983 as required under the rules of the Bank, and as such, he was not eligible to appear for the written test held on 26-2-1984. Therefore, no unfair labour practice was committed by the Bank management relating to the said workman, and Sundays on which he had not worked and was not paid, cannot be added to the total figure of 385 days for which he had worked intermittently in the Bank from September, 1983 to November, 1985.

15. The workman has relied on the following two cases of the Supreme Court.

(a) In the case reported in 1985 LIC Page No. 1733 (Il. D. Singh V/s. Reserve Bank of India), it was held that the confidential circular of the Reserve Bank stating that the 'Tikka Mazdoors' should not be engaged continuously, but should be offered work on rotation basis, and characterising mazdoors as Budlee workers amounted to an unfair labour practice. In the present case, as noted above, the Bank management had sent a letter to the workman that he should collect the necessary application form for the post of Budlee Sub-staff as his name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange. As such, no unfair labour practice was committed by the Bank in relation for the said workman.

(b) The other case relied upon by the workman is the one reported in 1986 LIC Page No. 98 between the workmen of the American Express Banking Corporation and their management. In this case it was held thus :—

"In view of the sub-section 2 of section 25-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, the workman shall be deemed to be in continuous service if he has actually worked under the employer for a particular period. The expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean those days only when the workman worked with hammer, sickles, or pen, but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which he was in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under the express or implied contract or service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc. Thus, Sundays and other paid holidays should be taken into account for the purpose of reckoning the total number of days which the workman could be said to have actually worked."

Therefore, all Sundays cannot be taken into consideration while counting the figure of 240 days. Only the Sundays for which the workman has been paid, or the Sundays on which he was under the employment of the employer can be taken into consideration while arriving at the figure of 240 days. I find that the total figure of 385 days mentioned above includes Sundays and holidays for which he was paid by the Bank management, and as such, the said workman had not completed 240 days' work during the period of 12 consecutive months. As such, there was no question of complying the provision of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act in relation to the said workman. Therefore, for the reasons mentioned above, the Issue No. 2, is found in the negative, and as such, the Issue No. 1 does not survive.

16. In the result, the action of the Bank management in terminating the services of the workman Shri Subhash V. Naik in November, 1985 is quite justified. The Issue No. 3 is found in the affirmative, and as such, the said workman is not entitled to reinstatement in service with effect from November, 1985. Issue No. 4 is found accordingly.

17. Even then, the Bank management may try to regularise the services of the workman from the year subsequent to the year 1985, in which he had completed the service of 240 days in a continuous period of 12 consecutive months, and when he was otherwise eligible for appointment in the Bank's service, at an early date.

18. The following Award is, therefore, passed.

AWARD

The action of the management of Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Subhash V. Naik in November, 1985 is just and proper.

However, the Bank management should try to regularise the services of the said workman from the year subsequent to the year 1985, in which he had completed 240 days' of service during a continuous period of 12 consecutive months, and was otherwise eligible for appointment in the Bank's service, at an early date.

The parties to bear their own costs of this reference.

P. D. APSHANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11, फरवरी, 1992

का. प्र. 745.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूचना में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निर्यातों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 11-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/436/89-डी-2 ए]

वी. के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 745.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-1992.

[No. L-12012/436/89-D.II (A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARJAN DEV, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 69 of 1990

In the matter of dispute,

BETWEEN

The Assistant General Secretary P.N.B. Staff Association C-2052 Indira Nagar, Lucknow.

AND

The Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank, Ashok Marg, Lucknow.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its Notification No. L-12012/436/89-D.II (A) dated 22-2-90 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

Whether the Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank Lucknow was justified in withdrawing the officiating chances of Sri S. P. Shukla, Daftary as Clerk at Kuthora Branch by not recognising the Madhyama exam of Hindi Sahitya Sammelan as equivalent to Intermediate Examination? If not, to what relief the workman was entitled?

2. In this case dated 8-10-91, 12-11-91, 12-12-91 were allowed to the Association for filing of the affidavit evidence on behalf of the workman but no affidavit evidence was filed by the Association. Ultimately on 22-1-92 when the case was taken up for hearing none appeared from the side of the Association. Sri S. Chatterjee appeared on behalf of the management in the case. Thus from the conduct and behaviour of the Association it appears that neither the workman nor the Association is interested in prosecuting the case. Therefore a no claim award is given in the case against the Association/workman.

3. The reference is, therefore, decided accordingly.

ARJAN DEV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14, फरवरी, 1992

का. प्र. 746.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 12 के अनुसूचना में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक काफ. इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निर्यातों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (स. 2) धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/875/88-डी-2ए]

वी. के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 746.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. II) Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-2-1992.

[No. L-12012/875/88-D.II (A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Ram, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 14 of 1989

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bank of India and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—Shri M. K. Sengupta, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar INDUSTRY : Banking

Dhanbad, the 31st January, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-12012/875/88-D.II (A), dated, the 18th May, 1989.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Om Prakash Singh and not considering him for further employment while recruiting fresh hands under Section 25-H of the I. D. Act, is justified? If not, to what relief the workman entitled?"

2. Both the parties have filed their W.S. separately. Shri Om Prakash Singh the concerned workman claims to be a permanent workman of the Bank of India Kessurgarh branch in the district of Dhanbad which is under the control direction and supervision of Branch Manager. The Branch Manager as stated by him works under the Regional Manager Bank of India, Dhanbad.

3. Shri Singh the concerned workman claim himself have been appointed as Sepoy/Security Guard on 30th December, 1983 on oral order of the Branch Manager, Kessurgarh branch and in that capacity he claims to have put in continuous service to the full satisfaction of the superior concerned.

4. The services of the concerned workman were however abruptly terminated with effect from 5-8-84 by an oral order of the branch manager, Kessurgarh branch on the flimsy ground that the concerned workman had failed in the written test held by the Bank which was never a condition during his initial employment. It is also stated that after the termination of the services of the concerned workman fresh recruitment was made almost simultaneously by the Bank and hence the termination of the concerned workman was illegal and unjustified. It was also stated that the services of the concerned workman was terminated without following the mandatory provision of Section 25-B, 25-F and 25-H of the I. D. Act. The industrial dispute was also alleged to have been raised before the ALC(C), Dhanbad which ended in failure. It has been prayed that the concerned Bank be directed to reinstate the concerned workman with full back wages.

5. The Bank of India has denied that the concerned workman was a permanent workman of the Bank of India, Kessurgarh branch. It is also not a fact that Shri Singh was working as Security Guard in Kessurgarh branch. According to the management, Shri Singh was engaged as badli Sepoy by their Kessurgarh branch on and from 30-12-83. The management has further denied that the services of the concerned workman was abruptly terminated. The fact was that Shri Singh was given opportunity to appear in the test and interview for his empanelment in the panel of badli Sepoy. He had appeared in the written test held on 26-2-84 but he did not fair well and again he was interviewed on 16-4-84. But this time also he failed and thereafter the Bank had stopped him on his badli Sepoy. According to the management Shri Singh had actually worked for 171 days only from 30-12-83 to 4-8-84 in Kessurgarh branch and he did not complete one year of continuous service. He also did not complete 240 days in a year or in the block of 12 months and therefore his case cannot be considered to be a case of termination/retranchment of services. In this back ground, it has been prayed that Shri Singh has got no merit in his case and that the award be answered accordingly.

6. The concerned workman claims to have been employed as Sepoy or Security guard but the management has denied this fact and stated that Shri Singh was employed as badli Sepoy by Kessurgarh branch from 30-12-83. Shri Singh has no paper to show that he was appointed as Sepoy or Security Guard for neither he was given any appointment letter nor any letter of termination and everything was oral. As against that the management has not proved photo copy of the vouchers through which the concerned workman was paid his necessary wages as badli staff on daily wage basis. These vouchers have been marked as Ext. M-2 series. In each of the vouchers the total days of works done by the concerned workman and the amount paid to him have been shown. On calculation the total working days comes to 171 days exclusive of holidays and Sundays. It appears that the concerned workman had also put his signature on the back of each voucher in token of the receipt of the money and this means that he was quite aware of the amount paid to him and also the days for which he worked. In each of the voucher Shri Singh, the concerned workman has been shown as badli Sepoy.

7. It is the case of the concerned workman that his services abruptly terminated with effect from 5-8-84 by an oral order of the branch Manager Kessurgarh branch. However it has been denied and according to the management Shri Singh did not pass the examination conducted by the Bank for empanelment of badli Sepoy and thereafter his name was dropped. First of all let us examine whether the concerned workman completed 240 days continuously and within a calendar year or not as required under Section 25-B of the I. D. Act, 1947. It is the case of the concerned workman that he was employed on 30-12-83 and his services were terminated on 5-8-84. In this connection I may also refer to the evidence of WW-1, the concerned workman. He has stated in his evidence that he worked till 19th October, 1984 and thereafter he was stopped by the Branch Manager but I find that was not the case in the W.S. filed by him. In the W.S. it has been stated in so many clear words that he worked till 5-8-84 and in that view of the matter he cannot be permitted to state against his own case. In this way it is quite manifest that he was in service for about 7 months and odd and he never completed one year of service. Ext. M-2 series are the vouchers. As discussed above it will also disclose the days of work for which the concerned workman was made necessary payment. Ext. W-1 is the failure report submitted by the ALC(C) to the Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Labour. While noting undisputed fact it was stated that the total attendance of the concerned workman was 219 days inclusive of closed holidays weekly off etc. Even accepting this fact it is true that the concerned workman did not work for about 240 days.

8. From certain documents filed on behalf of the management it will appear that a fresh panel of badli sub-office of the Zonal Manager to the Regional Manager and all staff was prepared and for that examinations were also conducted. Ext. M-3 is the circular letter issued from the Regional Office for formation of fresh panel of badli sub-staff through written test. The concerned workman WW-1, also stated that he had appeared in the examination but the result of the examination was not conveyed to him.

The document will show that Shri Singh failed twice and I do not think that any unsuccessful candidate was required to be communicated about his result. The learned counsel for the workman has placed reliance upon a judgement reported in 1989 Lab. I.C. page 1372 which has also been reported in AIR, 1989 Supreme Court page 1431. That was a case in which the services of an adhoc employee was terminated on the ground of unsuitability but there was no communication in advance about the defects in his work and deficiency in his performance. The Hon'ble Court held that the termination of services without communication would be arbitrary. Their Lordship took the view that in relation of master and servant there is moral obligation to act fairly. The employees should be made aware of the defect in his work and deficiency in his performance. Timely communication of the assessment of work in such case may put the employee on the right track and without any such communication it would be arbitrary to give a movement order to the employee on the ground of unsuitability.

Here we find that it was not at all the case of unsuitability or deficiency in performance. In the instant case the concerned workman was working as badli Sepoy and he had given an opportunity to pass the examination for his empanelment as badli Sepoy but he did not pass the examination. There was no question of any deficiency in his work and therefore the facts of the case in the authority as relied upon by the counsel cannot be made applicable with the instant case.

10. The document will show that the concerned workman has failed twice. Ext. M-1 is the admit card of the concerned workman for his appearing in the examination on 26-2-84 at Dhanbad Centre. Ext. M-5 is the list of badli sepy who had appeared in the examination. The name of the concerned workman appear in Sl. No. 137 in the. Ext. M-7 is the result wherein the name of the concerned workman does not appear and this means that he did not pass the examination. The cut of mark for the written examination held on 26-2-84 was 40 Ext. M-6 but the concerned workman had secured only 24 marks (Ext. M-5). Ext. M-11 is the letter from the Zonal Office Patna prescribing the norms for empanelment of badli subordinate staff. Ext. M-12 is the letter from the Regional Office, Dhanbad to the Employment Officer, Dhanbad for sponsoring the names of the candidates for preparation of panel. We find that the concerned workman was given one more chance to appear in the interview but this time also he failed. Ext. M-8 is the identity card issued to Shri Singh for his appearing in the interview on 16-4-87. Thus it is clear that the concerned workman did not pass the examination and hence he was stopped.

11. Some of the witnesses have been examined on behalf of the management. MW-1 Saktinath Jha has stated that the concerned workman was engaged as badli Sepoy vide letter dated 29-12-83. According to him that was a temporary engagement. He has proved the vouchers through which the payment was made to the concerned workman. MW-2 Shri K. C. Sethi was working as Industrial Relation Officer in the Bank of India. He has also proved certain documents. According to him the concerned workman was engaged as badli workman in the Bank of India at Kessurgarh branch. The learned counsel for the management has drawn my attention towards the definition of badli workman and according to him a badli or substitute is one who is employed in the post of a permanent workman or a probationer who is temporarily absent from duty but he would cease to be a badli on completion of continuous service of one year (240 days attendance in case of non-underground workman). In this way it was submitted that the concerned workman was still continuing as badli workman and he had not completed 240 days in a year.

12. Reliance was also placed upon 1989-LIC page 623. That was a case in which the employee (Guard-cum-Messenger) of the State Bank of India had been stopped from performing his duty orally by the Branch Manager on the ground that the delinquent made interpolation in the ledger of the Bank and was thus guilty of misconduct. The Hon'ble Court held that the oral order of termination amounted retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2(cc) of the I. D. Act. It was also held that since there was no compliance of Section 25-A of the I. D. Act, the delinquent was entitled to reinstatement with full back wages. Here for the sake

of convenience we may refer to the provision of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act and it provides that no workman employed in any industrial who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer unless certain conditions are fulfilled. According to the provision the workman is required to render one year continuous service. Again continuous service has been defined under Section 25-B of the I. D. Act and according to that provision a workman is said to be in continuous service provided he has worked under the employer for not less than 240 days in a year. The authority cited above shows that the workman was in continuous service of the Bank for more than 240 days but in the instant case we find that the concerned workman had not completed 240 days of service and so the question of any violation of the provision of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act does not arise. Further reliance was placed upon AIR 1986 (SC) page 123 and also reported in 1985 LIC page 1733. In that case the appellant was a thika mazdoor who had worked for more than 240 days. In this way I find that there two authorities cannot be applied in the instant case where the concerned workman has not completed 240 days of continuous service in a year or within a block of 12 months. For the reasons stated above I am to hold the view that the concerned workman was temporarily engaged as badli Sepoy and he did not complete the statutory period to attract the provision of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act and that he also did not qualify in the examination although he was given two chances for his empanelment as badli Sepoy. In the result I find no merit in the claim of the concerned workman and accordingly I am to hold that the action of the management in terminating the services of the concerned workman is justified and consequently the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

This is my Award.

B. RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 747—प्रौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सैमर्स बी.जी. सी.एल. की जोसगोरा कोलियरी का भीरा क्षेत्र के प्रबन्धसत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुसूच में निदिष्ट प्रौद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रौद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. 2, धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-24012/44/82-डी-4(B)/आई धार (कोल-I)]

बी.के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 747.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. II), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jealgora Colliery, Bhowra Area of BCCI, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th February, 1992.

[No. I-24012/44/82-D.IV (B)/IR (C-I)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Ram, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 3 of 1983

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Jealgora Colliery, Bhowra Area of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, RCMS.

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 31st January, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(44)/82-D.IV(B), dated, the 19th January, 1983.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the workmen of Jealgora Colliery Bhowra Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jealgora (Dhanbad) that Shri Bhuneshwar Pandey, Motor Driver/Dumper Operator should be regularised in category VI as per NCWA and paid wages accordingly, is justified? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?”

In this case both the parties appeared and filed their respective W.S. documents. Thereafter the case proceeded along its course. Subsequently at the stage of oral evidence both the parties appeared before me and filed a Joint Compromise petition. I heard both the parties on the said petition of compromise and do find that the terms contained therein are fair, proper and beneficial to both of them. Accordingly I accept the said petition of compromise and pass an Award in terms thereof which forms part of the Award as annexure.

B. RAM, Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, DHANBAD

In the matter of Reference No. 3 of 1983

PARTIES

Employers in relation to the Management of Jealgora Colliery of M/s. BCCL, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

JOINT COMPROMISE PETITION OF THE MANAGEMENT AND THE WORKMAN

The above mentioned employers and the workman/sponsoring Union most respectfully beg to submit jointly as follows :—

- (1) That the employers and the workmen/sponsoring union have jointly negotiated the matter covered by the aforesaid reference with a view to arriving at an amicable and mutually acceptable for over all settlement.
- (2) That as a result of such negotiations, the employers and the workmen/Sponsoring Union have agreed to settle the matter amicably and on an overall basis, on the following terms and conditions :—
 - (a) It is agreed that since Sri Bhuneshwar Pandey, Driver, the workman concerned was already placed by the Management in daily rated Category V vide Management's Office Order No. GM-PER/XI/87/1116—20 dated 2nd November, 1987 w.e.f. 1st July, 1977 and he has completed 10 years of service in Cat. V by 1st July, 1987, he will be placed in Cat. VI as per provisions of Para 2.11 of N.C.W.A.-IV w.e.f. 1st July, 1989 with one increment as a special case.
 - (b) It is agreed that the arrears that would be due to the workman concerned as a result of imple-

mentation of Clause (1) above will be paid by the Management to the workman concerned.

- (c) It is agreed that this is an overall settlement in full and final settlement of the claims of the workman and the sponsoring union arising out of the above reference.

- (3) That the employers and the workman/sponsoring union hereby jointly declares and confirm that they consider the aforesaid terms of settlement as just, fair and reasonable to both the parties.

In view of the above, the employers and the workman/sponsoring union jointly pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of the above reference in terms of the aforesaid terms and conditions of settlement and give an award to that effect.

Sd/-

(G. D. Pandey)
Working President,
RCMS Union.

On behalf of the workmen.

Sd/-

Dy. Chief Personnel Manager, Ar-XI
On behalf of the Management.

Sd/-

(S. Bose)
Secretary, RCMS Union,
For and on behalf of the workman.

Sd/-

(R. S. Murthy)
Advocate,
For the Employer.

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का.सा. 748.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार संसद की.सी.सी.एल. की गोविन्दपुर कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निरो-जकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं. 2), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-20012/257/86-डी-3(ए)]

वी.के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 748.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 11) Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure to the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Govindpur Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-2-92.

[No. L-20012/257/86-D.III(A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Ram, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. 64 OF 1987

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Govindpur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar, Union.

On behalf of the employers.—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 31st January, 1992

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/257/86-D.III (A) dated, the 28th January, 1987.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union that the management of Govindpur Colliery of Bharat Coking Coal Limited should regularise their workman, Shri Prayag Mahato in the job performed by him with protection of Group Wages is justified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. In this case both the parties filed their respective W. S. Thereafter during the course of hearing the management represented by Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate filed a petition stating therein that the concerned workman in this reference has already expired and the wife of the concerned workman has been provided employment and as such there is no dispute existing between the parties, and accordingly a 'No dispute' Award may please be passed. I heard both the parties and in the circumstances I am constrained to pass a 'No dispute' Award.

B. RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 749—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्तर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमि. के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अन्तर्गण में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सं० 2, धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 12-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-20012/8/87-डी-3(ए)/आई आर (कोल-1)]

बी. के. वेणुगोपालन, इसक अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 749.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure to the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Mgt. of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-2-1992.

[No. L-20012/8/87-D.III(A)/IR(Coal-I)]
V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Rani, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. 291 OF 1987

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act., 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. Koyla Bhawan, Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

On behalf of the employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 30th January, 1992

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/8/87-D.III.A dated, the 9th November, 1987.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited in not granting interim relief @ Rs. 100/- (Rupees one hundred only) per month to Shri Chaitu Mahato, workman and 43 others as mentioned in Annexure 'A' at par with those workmen to whom it is paid as per order of the Hon'ble High Court Patna, Ranchi Bench given in case No. CWJC No. 1228/83-R is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

ANNEXURE—A

Name	Designation	Place of working
1. Sri Rajbali Nisad	O.T.M. Driver	Central Pool.
2. Sri Chaitu Mahato	Sample Khalasi	Colliery Control Koyala Bhawan
3. Sri Dasrath Manjhi	-do-	-do-
4. Sri Shyam Manjhi	-do-	-do-
5. Sri Bhusan Manjhi	-do-	-do-
6. Sri Ram Manjhi	-do-	-do-
7. Suleman Mia	Pump Operator	Karmik Bhawan
8. Gobind	-do-	-do-
9. Lakshminarain Tiwari	Valve Man	-do-

1	2	3
10. Kalicharan Mandal	Vulb Man	Karmik Bhawan
11. M. Mandal	Mech. Fitter	-do-
12. Pancha Bouri	Pump Driver	-do-
13. Jagdish Hari	Sweeper	-do-
14. Sri Ganesh	-do-	-do-
15. Sri Jhappasi Ram	Samp. Khalasi	Quality Control
16. Sri Nunulal Tudur	-do-	-do-
17. Sri Jitan Ram	-do-	-do-
18. Sri Mitran Ray	Mali	Perso. Deptt.
19. Sri Roasan Mia	Samp. Khalasi	Quality Control
20. Sri Mitran Ray	-do-	-do-
21. Sri Hudum Manjhi	-do-	-do-
22. Sri Lakhu Napit	-do-	-do-
23. Sri Jitu Mahato	-do-	-do-
24. Sri Biswarup Karmakar	Diesel Operator	South Tisra Colly.
25. Sri Bagula Mondal	Driver	Central Pool, Koyla Bhawan
26. Sri Thakur Manjhi	Samp. Khalasi	Quality Control
27. Sri Kameswar Choubey	Driver	Central Pool, Koyla Bhawan
28. Sri Jamuna Saw	Driver	-do-
29. Sri Ram Mahato	Mech. Fitter	Karmik Bhawan, Civil
30. Sri Chamtu Mahato	Samp. Khalasi	Press Koyala Bhawan
31. Sri S.K. Mitra	Sr. Mech.	L.E.P. Lodna Fire Project
32. Sri N.D. Banerjee	-do-	-do-
33. Sri S.C. Kar	Dozer Operator	L.F.P.
34. Sri K.K. Sinha	-do-	B.O.C.P.
35. Sri D.K. Sengupta	-do-	Ena Fire Project
36. Sri Narain Singh	Diesel Operator	Ghanoodih Project
37. Sri Chatta Sarkar	Fitter Helper	L.F.P.
38. Sri Nagina Prasad	-do-	L.F.P.
39. Sri A. Nag	Fitter	R.O.C.P.
40. Sri Babulal Ram	Khansama	Finance Koyala Bhawan
41. Sri K.P. Gorai	Driver	Central Pool, Koyala Bhawan
42. Sri Raghunand Prasad	-do-	-do-
43. Sri Koyal Chandra Ray	-do-	Koyla Bhawan
44. Sri Manju Mondal	Peon (Previously he was helper attendant)	Legal Deptt. Koyala Bhawan

2. S/Shri Chaitu Mahato and 43 other as per annexure A are the concerned workmen of this reference. Admittedly they were originally employees of Coal Board a Central Govt. undertaking. According to the workmen they being the employees of Coal Board were governed by the same terms and conditions relating to their wages, modes of payment and other benefits admissible to monthly paid staff. The Coal Board was abolished on and from 31st March, 1975 and merged with Coal India Ltd. It was stated that as per order and the service conditions of the Coal Board employees after their merger was not to be adversely affected in any way. It may be mentioned that the concerned workmen were employees of Coal Board ropeways which CIL handed over to BCCL. Similarly the employees of the ropeways situated in West Bengal were merged with ECL.

3. Admittedly the employees of the ropeways in Bihar were given option to merge with NCWA-I scale from CPC scale. The workmen stated that CPC scale envisage payment at monthly rate together with fringe benefits. The concerned workmen opted for NCWA-I scale but the management in utter violation of order dated 31-3-75 unilaterally changed their service conditions and placed them into daily rated

employees. Ultimately the workmen of BCCL had to suffer and strike notice was served through their union.

4. It is stated further that some of the workmen of BCCL raised industrial dispute demanding monthly scale of pay giving rise to Ref. Case No. 30/1980. The reference as stated was answered in favour of the workmen by the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad. However, the management of BCCL preferred a Writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court, Ranchi Bench vide CWJC No. 1228/83(R). The Hon'ble High Court has been pleased to pass order on 9-9-83 to the effect that without prejudice to the rights of the parties and subject to the final order that should be passed in the Writ petition and with the consent of the parties the petitioner shall pay to each of the workmen Rs. 100 per month from January, 1983 over and above what they were getting. The operative portion of the order is reproduced below :—

"Without prejudice to the rights of the parties and subject to the final order that may be passed in this writ petition, we direct with consent of the parties that the petitioners shall pay to each of

the workmen Rs. 100 per month from the month of January, 1983 over and above what they were getting. The amount from January, 1983 to July, 1983 will be paid by 30-9-1983 and from August, 1983 with the salary bill of each month. With the above observations the application is disposed off.

5. The concerned workmen demanded scale of pay and benefits as per award passed in Ref. No. 30/80 or atleast payment of Rs. 100 per month as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in CWJC No. 1288/83(R) but the management paid no heed to their request. They also raised industrial dispute before the ALC(C) which ended in failure giving rise to the present reference. Since the dispute regarding the scale of pay and other benefits is pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court, the reference is confined only to interim relief of Rs. 100 per month.

6. The management through the W.S. has denied the claim of the concerned workman. Admittedly the concerned workmen were employees of Coal Board which merged with CIL with effect from 1-4-1975 with the same terms and conditions as existed prior to dissolution of Coal Board. At the time of absorption of the concerned workmen as employees of the present management, the Wage structure prevalent in the coal industry was in terms of NCWA-I with effect from 1-1-1975. The concerned workman and other employees of Coal Board were governed by the terms and conditions embodied in the recommendation of C.P.C. Accordingly the concerned workmen accepted NCWA-I pay structure. The pay structure underwent changes from 1-1-79 with the introduction of NCWA-II giving a large number of benefits to the employees. Again pay structure was revised with the introduction of NCWA-III with effect from 1-1-83 giving a good number of benefits to the employees in various wages and so the concerned workmen cannot have any grievance against the management. It is stated that some of the employees after their acceptance of NCWA-I pay scale demanded the same terms and conditions given to some employees of E.C.L. on the basis of certain settlement arrived at between the management and the workmen. Admittedly the said dispute was adjudicated at Dhanbad in Ref. 30/80 and award was passed in favour of the workmen. The management filed Writ petition challenging the Award and its operation has been stayed with the grant of Rs. 100 as interim relief per month. It was contended that the concerned workman accepted the pay scale under NCWA-I which was revised from time to time as stated above and they derived all the benefits of the successive wage revision. Since the concerned workmen have already taken advantage and so they are not entitled to any further relief.

7. The only point for consideration is whether the concerned workmen can be given interim relief of Rs. 100 per month like the workmen of Ref. No. 30/80. The concerned workmen were definitely not a party of CWJC. 1288/83(R) and they are demanding relief of Rs. 100 per month on the ground that the workmen of Ref. No. 30/80 were placed in the same terms and conditions as the concerned workmen and so the benefits granted to them by the Hon'ble Court should be extended to these concerned workmen. WW-I Shri Rajbali Nishad has stated the details as to how they accepted BCCL scale of pay under NCWA-I. Shri R. P. Shukla for the management while deposing as MW-I stated that the concerned workman never raised any dispute that they be given old scale what they were getting in the Coal Board. They never raised any dispute for conversion of their time rated scale to monthly rated scale.

8. Now let us see the operative portion of the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court. The Hon'ble Court was pleased to direct with the consent of the parties that the petitioner BCCL shall pay each of the workmen Rs. 100 per month from January 1983 over and above what they were getting. Thus it is apparent that both the parties had agreed and the amount of Rs. 100 per month was given with the consent of the parties. The concerned workmen of this reference were admittedly not the parties nor their consent was ever taken and this Court is not aware as to what were the circumstances which brought the parties to the terms and agreement and they agreed for interim benefit of Rs. 100 per month, and this being the position they cannot be granted relief of Rs. 100 per month as claimed by them. Hence I find no merit in the claim of the concerned workmen and

the action of the management of M/s. BCCL in not granting interim relief of Rs. 100 per month to Chaitu Mahato and 43 others as mentioned in Annexure-A to the order of reference is justified and consequently the concerned workmen are not entitled to interim relief of Rs. 100 per month.

B. RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का. शा. 750.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुमरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेमस बी.सी. सी.एल.की सिमलाबहाल कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके धर्मकारों के बीच, अनुसूच में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं. 1), धनबाद के पंचाट कोर्ट प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 13-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-20012/153/88-आई आर (कोल-I)]

वी. के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 750.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Simlabahal Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13-2-92.

[No. L-20012/153/88-IR(Coal-I)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 74 of 1989.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Simlabahal Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.,

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri B. K. Ghosh, Member, Executive Committee, Janta Mazdoor Sangh.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 28th January, 1992.

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(153)/88-I.R. (Coal-I), dated the 13th June, 1989, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1)

and sub-section (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of Simlabahal Colliery, Bhalgora Area of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., in terminating Shri Baso Ram, Night Guard from service w.e.f. 12-11-83 is justified? If not to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The case of the management of Simlabahal Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., as disclosed in the written statement-cum-rejoinder, details apart, is as follows :

The present reference is not legally maintainable. Baso Ram, the concerned workman, was working as Night Guard in the night of 12-12-82 to guard the Cash Room of Bhalgora Colliery office. On that particular date during night hours, an amount of Rs. 2,03,537.10 (Rupees two lakhs, three thousand, five hundred thirty seven and paise ten) only was stolen from the Iron Safe of the Cash Room by opening the gate and Iron Safe using external force and not unlocking with the help of keys. F.I.R. dated 13-12-82 was lodged and a chargesheet dated 13-12-82 was issued to the concerned workman alongwith others. The police searched some of the houses of suspected persons responsible for committing theft and seized huge amounts of cash from different persons. The workmen of the colliery from whose possession the stolen cash was recovered were also chargesheeted and disciplinary action was taken against them. It is quite natural that the theft of the cash from Iron Safe could not be possible without connivance of the concerned workman. Alternately he was sleeping while on duty or had left his place of duty unauthorisedly. In such circumstances it was a case of neglect of duty with full consciousness of consequences. The management suffered a huge loss of money either due to complicity of the workman with the offence of theft or due to his intentional act of negligence and in both the cases he committed the misconduct of dishonesty in connection with company's business. The concerned workman submitted his reply dated 20-3-83 denying the allegation levelled against him. The management decided to conduct a departmental enquiry against him. Shri B. D. Singh, the then Dy. Personnel Manager of Kustore Area was appointed Enquiry Officer and the departmental enquiry was held in conference to the principles of natural justice. The concerned workman was found guilty of the charge of misconduct levelled against him in the departmental enquiry. He was dismissed from service by letter dated 9/12-11-83. It has been submitted that the action of the management in dismissing him from service with effect from 12-11-83 is legal, bonafide and in accordance with the provision of the Standing Orders.

3. The case of the concerned workman, as appearing from the written statement submitted on his behalf by the sponsoring union, Janta Mazdoor Sangh, briefly stated, is as follows :

Baso Ram, the concerned workman, was a permanent workman of Simlabahal Colliery (Bhalgora Section); he was chargesheeted by the management on 13-12-82 for commission of misconduct of dishonesty

in connection with employer's business and neglect of work while he was on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 mid-night on 12-12-82. The chargesheet discloses that a theft took place in the colliery cash room while he was on duty at the Cash Room of Bhalgora office due to his negligence of work. He was a Night Guard for the whole office containing several sections of two buildings on either side of a road. It is incorrect to say that he was guard at the Cash Room. The Cash Room is within and enclosed by the General Office building. There is no independent entrance to the same except through the general office premises. It has been irrelevantly incorporated in the chargesheet that he had opened the lock of the main office and allowed Arjun Yadav to keep his cycle there without approval or permission of the Manager. Arjun Yadav was not connected with the alleged incident of theft. It is pertinent to mention that in his evidence before the S.D.J.M. Dhanbad in the criminal case related to the same incident, Arjun Yadav stated that he used to keep his cycle in the general office whenever he was on duty in the night shift. There is no evidence to prove that alleged incident of theft was taken place between 4 p.m. and 12 mid-night of 12-12-82 which was the duty hours of the concerned workman. The concerned workman had made over clear charge to his reliever, Ram Prasad Barhi at the end of his shift at 12 mid-night. Shri Bhar was on duty from 12 mid-night to 8 a.m. on 13-12-82. Ram Prasad Barhi was also similarly charge-sheeted and dismissed from service for the same offence which shows that the management had no satisfactory evidence to prove the misconduct alleged against the concerned workman. Suresh Pandey, Havildar was also charge-sheeted and dismissed in relation to the same alleged incident by the management. But in Reference No. 142 of 1986 the Hon'ble Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 at Dhanbad has observed that there is no iota of evidence to indicate that the Night Guards were not on their post or that they were also sleeping on duty. Sri Pandey was awarded reinstatement with full back wages. Although Ram Prasad Bhar, the co-worker of the concerned workman, similarly charge-sheeted, was not an official witness, he was interrogated by the Enquiry Officer to create a difference between them and difference in their statements. The Enquiry Officer utilised the difference in order to arrive at the conclusion of guilt of the concerned workman. The Enquiry Officer has also stated that the concerned workman had a hand in the theft of cash from the safe of Simlabahal Colliery. The disciplinary authority being misled by the report of the Enquiry Officer awarded punishment of dismissal of the concerned workman from service improperly. In the circumstances, the union has submitted that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman is unjustified and that he be reinstated in service with full back wages.

In rejoinder to the written statement of the sponsoring union, the management has reiterated the statement of facts as disclosed in the written statement.

In rejoinder to the written statement of the management, the union has also asserted the facts as disclosed in its written statement.

4. At the instance of the management the propriety and fairness of the domestic enquiry was considered as preliminary issue. The parties arrayed did not

adduce any oral evidence but the management laid in evidence the entire domestic enquiry proceedings which were marked Exts. M-1 to M-8.

It was held upon consideration of materials on record, that the domestic enquiry was held fairly and properly. Thereafter the case was heard on merits. At the time of hearing the union has submitted some documents which, being awards of the Tribunal and judgement of the Criminal Court have been marked as Exts. W-1 to W-3.

5. Shri B. Joshi, learned Advocate appearing for the management, has submitted that upon consideration of evidence on record the misconduct of the concerned workman, as set forth in the charge-sheet has been amply proved.

On the other hand, Shri B. K. Ghosh, authorised representative of the sponsoring union, has contended that the materials on record do not indicate that the theft was committed during the duty hours of the concerned workman nor do they indicate that the concerned workman was in any way guilty of neglect of duty.

6 The concerned workman, Baso Ram, was admittedly a permanent workman working as Night Guard in Simlabahal colliery (Bhalgora Section) of M/s. B. C. C. Ltd. The evidence on record indicates that on 12-12-82 the concerned workman was deployed on duty as Night Guard in the second shift commencing from 4 p.m. and lasting till 12 mid-night. The evidence on record further discloses that he took charge from Dhoken Prasad who was on duty presumably on the first shift on 12-12-82. It is the case of the management that his duty was to guard the cash room of Bhalgora colliery office. The union has asserted in the written statement that the duty of the concerned workman was to guard the whole office containing several sections in two buildings on either side of a road. Thus, it remains a matter of dispute whether the concerned workman was deployed for duty to guard the cash room exclusively or it was his duty to guard the whole office containing several sections in two buildings on either side of the road. Anyway, a theft was committed in the cash room of Bhalgora colliery office involving an amount of Rs. 2,03,537.10 (Rupees two lakhs three thousand, five hundred thirty seven and paise ten) only. It appears that consequent upon this occurrence at least three workmen were issued with the charge-sheets viz., (1) Baso Ram, the concerned workman, (2) Ram Prasad Bahri, another Night Guard admitted on duty from 12 mid-night of 12-12-82 to 8 a.m. of 13-12-82 and (3) Suresh Kumar Pandey, Havildar who was on petrol duty between 10 p.m. of 12-12-82 and 6 a.m. of 13-12-82. The written statement of the management indicates that huge amount of cash were seized by the police from different persons and the workmen of the colliery from whose possession the stolen cash were recovered, were also charge-sheeted and disciplinary action was also taken against them.

7. Anyway, consequent upon occurrence of theft the following chargesheet was issued to the concerned workman (Ext. M-1).

"It has come to the notice of the undersigned that on Sunday i.e. 12-12-1982, while you

were on duty from 4 p.m. to 12 mid-night of 12-12-82 at the cash room of Bhalgora colliery office, a theft took place in the colliery cash room due to your negligence of duty as a result of which the company has sustained a loss of Rs. 2,03,537.10.

You had also opened the lock of the main office and allowed Shri Arjun Yadav, Night Guard to keep his cycle there without the approval or permission of the undersigned.

Your above action amounts to serious negligence of your duty. As such, you are hereby charged under the following clause of Model Standing Orders applicable to the colliery.

17(a) Dishonesty in connection with employer's business.

(f) Neglect of work.

You are hereby called upon to explain in writing within 48 hours or receipt of this chargesheet as to why disciplinary action should not be taken against you for the above misconduct.

You are hereby suspended forthwith from your duty pending departmental enquiry."

The concerned workman submitted his reply to the charge-sheet (Ext. M-2), an excerpt from which is gleaned hereinbelow :

"That the allegations made in the charge-sheet that I was in duty of cash room on 12-12-82 and due to my negligence there was theft from the cash room causing loss of a sum of Rs. 2,03,537.10 is not true and correct. It is true that on 12-12-82 I was engaged as Night Guard for the shift from 4 p.m. to 12 P.M. in the colliery office of Simlabahal colliery. The Cash Room was situated inside the general office of the colliery and I was engaged as Night Guard and posted outside the office. The real fact is that on 4 p.m. I took the charge of Night Guard from another guard, Dhokal Prasad who had duty from 8 a.m. to 4 a.m. and on receipt of the charge I made the necessary check of the lock of the outer door of the office and also found the back door duly bolted from inside as usual and I performed my duty gently and honestly during my shift period and at 12 p.m. I duly handed over the charge of my duty to the other Night Guard Shri Ramo Prasad Bahri, who after making necessary checking accepted the charge and I had left for my quarter. No theft took place during my duty hours and as such no question of being negligent can arise at all. You will kindly appreciate that as a night guard I had there duty outside the office having strong lock and door. It may further be

mentioned that the back door of the office is situated on a lonely place accessible to all and it was physically impossible for any man posted outside the main door of the office to keep watch on the back door, which is neither visible nor closely situated. Further, I beg to submit that I have been informed that the actual culprits have been apprehended by the police and the money has also been recovered and from the investigation it transpired that the theft took place in between 12 p.m. to 1.00 a.m. (when I was not in duty) and by entering from the back side by some employees of the very colliery office who had previous knowledge of everything. Even the lock of the safe was not broken but it was opened by some key or device. No incriminating substance came during the investigation against me rather it was found beyond any doubt that I was wrongly raped in the above case.

It is true that the lock of the outer office was once opened by me to enable Arjun Yadav to keep his cycle in the office. But Arjun Yadav was nobody else but another Night Guard posted in the colliery and as per practice and procedure he was allowed to keep his cycle inside the office. The aforesaid fact cannot be treated as the ground for the theft of the money, as admittedly the theft took place much after the said incident.

It will not be out of place to mention here that I am a loyal honest sincere workman of the organisation and I have been rendering my services from the year 1961 without any complaint of any nature against me nor there was any reason or occasion for the management to question my integrity or honesty and sincerity earlier.

8. Admittedly, Model Standing Orders for Industrial Establishment in Coal Mines is applicable to the establishment of the management of Bhalgora Section of Simlabahal colliery. Clause 17(1)(a) envisages that theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with employer's business or property is a misconduct. Clause 17(1)(f) discloses that habitual neglect of work is a misconduct. The charge-sheet issued to the concerned workman discloses that he committed misconduct of dishonesty in connection with employer's business under Clause 17(1)(a) and neglect of work under Clause 17(1)(f) of the Model Standing Orders. Clause 17(1)(f) envisages that habitual neglect of work is a misconduct and not neglect of work simpliciter.

9. In order to establish the charge of misconduct it is essential for the management to establish that the theft was committed between 4 p.m. and 12 mid-night of 12-12-82 when the concerned workman was on duty. I am constrained to state that there is not even a shred of evidence on record to indicate

that theft was committed during the duty hours of the concerned workman. The Enquiry Officer has not recorded his finding on this aspect of the matter in his enquiry report. He has given a free flight of his imagination to conclude that had the concerned workman been alert attentive on (to) his duty the theft could have been detected if not checked at all and that this transpired that due to his negligence the theft occurred in that night. The conclusion of the Enquiry Officer—pre-supposed that the theft was committed within duty hours of the concerned workman. But as I have pointed out before that there is no vestige of evidence to indicate that such was the position. Sri Ram Prasad Bahri, another Night Guard and his reliever took charge from him and he was on duty from 12 mid-night of 12-12-82 to 8 a.m. on 13-12-82. Sri Bahri did not complain that everything was not in order when he took charge from the concerned workman. I have pointed out before that Havildar, Suresh Kr. Pandey, who was on patrolling duty between 10 a.m. of 12-12-82 and 6 a.m. of 13-12-82 was also charge-sheeted consequent upon the occurrence of theft and was dismissed from service. But the Presiding Officer of Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in Reference No. 162 of 1986 (Ext. W-1) rendered an award holding him not guilty of the charge levelled against him and directed the management to reinstate him in service with arrears of back wages and consequential benefits. Ram Prasad Bahri was also dismissed from service and this Tribunal held him guilty of the charge of neglect of duty and decided that the action of the management in dismissing him from service was justified in Reference No. 72 of 1989 (Ext. W-2). It appears that the concerned workman and others stood their trial before Shri S. N. Jha, Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Dhanbad under charges of commission of offence under Section 457 and 380 read with 411 of I. P. C. on the self same occurrence. All of them were acquitted of the charges (Ext. W.3).

10. Considering the entire evidence on record, I come to the conclusion that there is no evidence of theft having been committed during the duty hours of the concerned workman. Hence, he can not be held to be guilty of misconduct of dishonesty in connection with employer's business or habitual neglect of work. That being so, the action of the management in dismissing him from service is not justified and he should be reinstated in service with full back wages and consequential benefits.

11. Accordingly, the following award is rendered—the action of the management of Simlabahal Colliery, Bhalgora Area of M/s. B. C. C. Ltd. in terminating Shri Baso Ram, Night Guard from service with effect from 12-11-83 is not justified. The management is directed to reinstate the concerned workman in service with effect from that date and pay him back wages and other consequential benefits within one month from the date of publication of the award.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

This is my award.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

Dhanbad in dismissing Sri Sahdeo Dusadh, Trammer from service is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

का.आ. 751.—औद्योगिक विवाद प्रवर्धन, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सैमर्थ बी.सी. सी.एन बी भोरा (एस.) कोलियरी के भोरा क्षेत्र में 11 के प्रबन्ध तंत्र के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (म. 1), धनबाद के प्रकरण को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार का 13-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[नया नं-24012/221/87-डी(-4) (बी)आईआर (कोल-1)]

बी.के. वैणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 751.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. I), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Mgt. of Bhowra (S) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s B.C.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13-2-92.

[No. I-24012/221/87-DIV(B) IIR (Col-I)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 51 of 1988

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (S) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. B.C.C.L. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workman : Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.
STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 29th January, 1992.

AWARD

By Order No. L-24012(221)/87-DIV(B), dated, the 23rd March, 1988, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the Management of Bhowra (S) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., P.O. Bhowra, Dist.

2. The case of the management of Bhowra (S) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., as disclosed in the written statement, details apart, is as follows :

Sahdeo Dusadh, Trammer of 37/38 Incline of Bhowra South Colliery committed serious assault on Sri Y. P. Ohri, Agent, Bhowra (South) Colliery on 17-7-86 at about 9.20 a.m. Since the concerned workman Sahdeo Dusadh, committed serious act of misconduct chargesheet dated 18/9-7-86 was issued to him. He submitted his written explanation to the chargesheet denying the charges. Explanation submitted by him not being found satisfactory, the matter was referred for departmental enquiry. Sri A. K. Srivastava, the then Dy. Personnel Manager of Bhowra Area was appointed as the Enquiry Officer for conducting the departmental enquiry. The concerned workman fully participated in the enquiry which was held in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Enquiry Officer found the concerned workman guilty of the charge levelled against him and submitted his report accordingly. The disciplinary authority agreeing with the report and findings of the Enquiry Officer and considering the seriousness of misconduct dismissed him from service with effect from 9-9-86. The dismissal was also approved by the competent authority. The management, in the circumstances, has submitted that its action in dismissing the concerned workman from service is fully justified.

3. The case of the concerned workman, as appearing from the written statement submitted on his behalf by the sponsoring union, Bihar Mines Laljhanda Mazdoor Union, briefly stated, is as follows :

The concerned workman had been working as permanent Trammer in M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. since long with unblemished record of service. All the workmen of the colliery are entitled to free supply of domestic coal. The local management instead of supplying domestic coal to the employees of the colliery has been pilfering the same to the local market for sale for their self gain. The concerned workman demanded free supply of coal from the management. The local management was very much annoyed due to his persistent demand for free supply of coal. Colliery official went to the extent of assaulting him so that he had to undergo treatment to recover from his wounds from 18-6-85 to 1-8-85. Due to mental and physical torture he had lost mental balance and so he remained under treatment in mental hospital at Ranchi from 4-9-86 to 16-9-86. He also lodged F.I.R. at Bhowra outpost. Under Sec. 341, 325 and 506 read with 34 of I.P.C. The management, with an ulterior motive to cloud the real issue and to hide the actual fact issued a false chargesheet to him on the ground of allegedly assaulting Y.P. Orhi, Superintendent of the Colliery. The management also lodged a false and concocted F.I.R. against him for assaulting Sri Orhi. He submitted his reply denying the charge emphatically. Sri A. K. Srivastava, Dy. Personnel Manager, who was subordinate to Sri Orhi was appointed Enquiry Officer by the management of the colliery. Sri Srivastava was appointed Enquiry Officer as he would dance to the tune of the management. The Enquiry Officer was biased and prejudiced against him. The departmental enquiry was held in an invalid and

irregular manner in which he was not afforded full opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses for the management. It is alleged that the departmental enquiry was not held in accordance with the principles of natural justice. He was dismissed from service by unauthorised person. His case was represented before the management but to no effect. In the circumstances, the union raised an industrial dispute over the matter. It has been asserted by the union that the action of the management in dismissing him from service was illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the principles of natural justice.

4. In rejoinder to the written statement of the sponsoring union, the management has admitted that the concerned workman had been working as permanent trammer in M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. But denied all other statement of facts made by the union in support of the case the concerned workman.

5. In rejoinder to the written statement of the management, the sponsoring union has denied all the material facts as contained in the written statement of the management and asserted that dismissal of the concerned workman from service is illegal and unjustified.

6. At the instance of the management the propriety and fairness of domestic enquiry was considered as preliminary issue. In the course of hearing the preliminary issue the management examined two witnesses, namely, MW-1 Lalan Pandey and MW-2 P. K. Ray and laid in evidence the entire mass of domestic enquiry proceedings which were marked Exts. M-1 to M-6.

Upon consideration of evidence on record it was held that the domestic enquiry was held fairly and properly. Thereafter the case was heard on merits.

7. Admittedly, Sahadeo Dusadh was working as Trammer in 37/38 Incline of Bhowra (South) Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. According to the management, he committed serious acts of misconduct by assaulting Y. P. Orhi, Agent, Bhowra (South) Colliery on 17-7-86 at about 9.20 a.m. and was issued with a chargesheet dated 18/19-7-86 and dismissed from service with effect from 9-9-86 after being found guilty in domestic enquiry. Neither the pleading of the management nor the evidence or documents produced by the management in departmental enquiry spells out the reason or motive for alleged assault on Shri Orhi. The Enquiry Officer has not spared any pain to enquire into the reason or motive for alleged assault on Sri Orhi and thereby he has faulted on the issue.

The pleading of the union endeavoured to provide the reason for occurrence. According to the union, all the workmen of the colliery are entitled to free supply of domestic coal and the local management was very much annoyed with the concerned workman for his persistent demand for free supply of domestic coal and that the colliery official assaulted him for which he lodged an F.I.R. at the P.S. under Section 341, 325 and 506/34 of I.P.C. It has been alleged further that the management with an ulterior motive to cloud the issue and hide the actual fact, issued a false chargesheet against him on the alleged ground of assaulting Y.P. Orhi, Agent of the colliery.

In essence, the reason for the occurrence, according to the union, is the annoyance of the local management with the concerned workman for his persistent demand for free supply of coal and to obfuscate the real fact he was framed up on a false charge.

8. It appears that the management examined five witnesses including the complainant Y. P. Orhi in domestic enquiry and laid in evidence as many as seven items of documents which included the charge-sheet, reply to the charge-sheet, copy of F.I.R., X-ray report and other documents. The concerned workman examined himself and three other witnesses. In the statement before the Enquiry Officer the concerned workman stated that one day before the occurrence he had gone to the Agent, Sri Orhi with an application for free supply of coal but the Agent expressed his regret in the matter by endorsement on the application but as he was illiterate he could not understand it and yet it explained by another person. Again on the next day he approached Sri Orhi for supply of coal as his family was starving, but Sri Orhi became furious, called him bad names and assaulted him by shoes. His statement discloses that both Shri Lalan Pandey and B. N. Jha also hit him causing bleeding injury and they took him to the office of Sri Jha where Bikram Yadav, Bibhuti Upadhyaya and Rameshwar Singh separated them by holding their hands. His statement also discloses that the police came, took him into custody and put him inside the lock up and that he submitted report about the occurrence in Bhowra P.S. He was released on the very same day and went to the State Dispensary, Patherdih, where no doctor was available and thereafter he went to Bhowra Hospital where Dr. Pandhi treated him and gave him medicine and injections, and ultimately he was admitted in Bhowra Hospital where he underwent treatment for four days. Shri Orhi could not deny if the concerned workman approached him with another complaint or not. This being the position, the evidence on record gives a glimere of facts that the concerned workman had some grievance over supply of coal for the redressal of which he approached Sri Orhi but could not get any assistance.

As I have stated before the pleading of the management or the evidence, oral or documentary laid by the management in domestic enquiry has failed to provide any reason or motive that the alleged assault on Orhi by the concerned workman and that the pleading of the union has endeavoured to suggest the reason or motive for the occurrence. Upon consideration of materials on record, I have held that there remains a reason for occurrence for the simple reason that there cannot be any fire without smoke.

9. Anyway, the management issued the following chargesheet to the concerned workman (Ext.M-1);

"It has been reported that on 17-7-86 at about 9.20 a.m. you all of a sudden attacked Shri Y. P. Orhi, Superintendent of Mines Agent, Bhowra (S) Colliery in the Varanadah outside his office and assaulted him with a lathi which caused him grievous injury on his left arm.

The above act of yours constitutes misconduct under the certified standing orders applicable to Bhowra (S) Colliery governing your service conditions.

27(5) Fighting, riotous or disorderly or indecent behaviour.

27 (19) Any breach of Indian Mines Act or any other Act or of any Rule or by laws thereunder or, of Standing Orders.

You are hereby asked to explain in writing within 48 Hrs of the receipt of this chargesheet as to why disciplinary action including termination of service should not be taken against you for the above acts of mis-conduct. If you will fail to reply the charge-sheet within the stipulated period it will be presumed that you have no explanation to offer and that you accept the charges levelled against you and the Management will proceed to take suitable action as may deem appropriate."

The concerned workman submitted his reply to the charge-sheet denying the charges. The management held departmental enquiry in the course of which it examined five witnesses including Y. P. Orhi, the complainant. Besides, Y. P. Orhi, the management examined S/Shri B. N. Jha, Senior Personnel Officer, Lalan Pandey, Personnel Officer, Ramphal Yadav, Office Peon and Dr. Ali Mazhar Sr. M. O., Jealgora Hospital. Y. P. Orhi stated that the concerned workman assaulted him with a stick/Danda on his shoulder and aimed another blow on his head which he worded off with his left hand which in the process got injured. Then the concerned workman attempted to charge him for the 3rd time. S/Shri Lalan Pandey and B. N. Jha caught hold of his stick and separated them. P. N. Jha and Lalan Pandey have also corroborated Y. P. Orhi. Besides the statement of Ramphar Yadav lends support to the statement of the witnesses.

10. On the other hand, another picture is emerging from the statement of the concerned workman and his witnesses. According to the concerned workman, he approached Y. P. Orhi with his application for free supply of coal, but Orhi got annoyed, assaulted him and thereafter he was further assaulted by B. N. Jha and Lalan Pandey and while these two officials took him to the office of Sri Jha he was rescued by Rameshwar Singh, Bibhuti Upadhyay and Bikram Yadav. Rameshwar Singh has supported the concerned workman in the domestic enquiry by stating that S/Shri B. N. Jha and Lalan Pandey were beating the concerned workman with fist and then took him to the office of Sri Jha and on being asked Sri Jha told him (witness) that 'sala has proudy' and thereafter he informed the police. Hridyaram and Harendra Singh have stated that Sri Orhi abused the concerned workman and assaulted him. Harendra Singh has further stated that Sri Orhi kicked the concerned workman and when he again tried to kick the concerned workman further he lost his balance and got injured. It appears that both Sri Orhi and the concerned workman lodged F.I.R. in the P.S. The Enquiry Officer has disbelieved the evidence or the concerned workman and his witnesses as because there existed some contradictions. Such contradictions

ces, I am constrained to hold that the Enquiry Officer was not justified in discarding the evidence of the concerned workman and his witnesses in toto.

11. From the evidence on record the picture that emerges is that a fight ensued between Sri Orhi and the concerned workman and as a consequence both of them suffered injury.

12. Even if the evidence laid by the management is believed and the evidence laid by the concerned workman is disbelieved then also the punishment of dismissal of the concerned workman from service is not justified because, in my view, justice should be tempered with mercy and the erring workman should be given opportunity to reform himself and prove to be a disciplined employee. In this connection the decision reported in 1989 Lab I. C. 1043 (SC) (Scooter India Limited, Lucknow Vs. Labour Court and others) may be cited in support of this proposition. In my view, the concerned workman should submit an undertaking to his employer for behaving himself properly in future and should act as a loyal and disciplined workman. The management is directed to reinstate him in service provided he submit the undertaking as aforesaid and pay him 50 per cent of back wages from the date of the present reference i.e. 23-3-1988 till he is allowed to resume duty. The period of his absence from duty from the date of his dismissal from service till the date of the present reference shall be treated as leave without pay.

13. Accordingly, the following award is rendered—the action of the management of Bhowra (S) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., P.O. Bhowra, Dist. Dhanbad, in dismissing Sri Sahdeo Dusadh, Trammer, from service is not justified. The order of dismissal of the concerned workman from service is hereby set aside. The management is directed to reinstate him in service and pay him 50 per cent of back wages from the date of reference (23-3-1988) till he is allowed to resume his duty within one month from the date of publication of the award provided he submits undertaking to the management as stated hereinbefore. The concerned workman is directed to report for duty within one month from the date of publication of the award.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का. प्रा. 752.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूचन में केन्द्रीय सरकार मसर्स वी सी० सी० एल. की बरारी कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. 2), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 13-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था। -

[सं० एन० 240/2/70/86-डी 4(बी) आई आर (कोल 1)]

बी० के० धेनुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 752.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Mgt. of Bararee Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13-2-92.

[No. L-24012/70/86-D.IV(T)IR(Coal I)]
V. K. VENUGOPLAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD
PRESENT :

Shri B. Ram, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Reference No. 52 of 1987

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Bararee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Bhulanbararee, District, Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : Shri S. Bose, Secretary, RCMS.

On behalf of the employers : Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 31st January, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(2) of I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012/70/86 D.IV(B), dated the 12th January, 1987.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bararee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited in not regularising Shri Sudhin Singh, Munshi as Attendance Clerk Grade-II w.e.f. 12-6-1983 is justified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. In this case instead of filing their respective W.S. etc. both the parties appeared before me and filed a Joint compromise petition. I heard both the parties on the said petition and I do find that the terms contained therein are fair, proper and beneficial to both of them. Accordingly I accept the said petition of compromise and pass an Award in terms thereof which forms part of the Award as Annexure.

Sd/-
B. RAM, Presiding Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 DHANBAD

In the matter of Ref. No. 52 of 1987

Employers in relation to the Management of Bararee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. P.O. Bhulan Bararee, District, Dhanbad.

VS.

Their Workmen

Joint Compromise Petition of Employers and Workmen

The above mentioned employers most respectfully beg to submit jointly as follows :—

- (1) That the employers and the workman have jointly negotiated the matter covered by the aforesaid reference with a view to arriving at an amicable mutually acceptable settlement.
- (2) That as a result of such negotiations the employers and the workmen have agreed to settle the matter covered by the aforesaid reference on the following terms and conditions :—
 - (a) It is agreed that the Management has regularised Sri Sudhin Singh, Munshi, the workman concerned in the post of Attendance Clerk, Grade-II w.e.f. 1-10-82. This is the date from which other similar workers were regularised and have given him all the consequential benefits.
 - (b) It is agreed that in view of clause (a) above, the dispute between the employers and the workmen has been fully settled and resolved.
- (3) That the employers and the workmen hereby confirm and declare that they consider that the aforesaid agreement is fair, just and reasonable to both the parties.

In view of the above the employers and the workmen jointly pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may please to accept the joint compromise petition and dispose of the reference accordingly and give and award in terms thereof.

Asst. Secretary,

(H. K. DEY),
General Manager
Bharat Coking Coal Limited
for and on behalf of Management
(Raj S. Murthy.) Advocate

R.C.M.S.

Bararee Colliery Branch,
for and on behalf of workmen
(Sudhin Singh)
Munshi

Witnesses :

- (1) Sd/- (Illegible)
- (2) Sd/- (Illegible)

Dhanbad
Dt.

नई दिल्ली 14 फरवरी, 1992

का.आ. 753—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, कन्द्रीय सरकार मंगरी बा.सी.सी.एल. की मूनदीह प्रोजेक्ट के प्रबन्धनार्थक क सबडि विभागकी और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध से निरापट औद्योगिक विवाद में कन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक आयोग (सं. 1), धनबाद के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो कन्द्रीय सरकार का 13-2-92 का प्राण हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-20012/132/90-आई आर (कोल-1)]

आ.क. वगुगोपालन, डस्क आयोगी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 753.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the mgmt. of Moonidih Project of M/s. BCCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13-2-92.

[No. L-20012/132/90-IR (Coal 1)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 219 of 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project under M/s. SBCC Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra,
Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate
For the Workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 30th January, 1992

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012 (132)/90-I.R. (Coal-I), dated, the 26th September, 1990, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of Moonidih Project under M/s. BCCL in

awarding punishment of dismissal to Shri Sohan Bouri, Miner/Loader under Order No. ND/PO/Per/Dismissal/89/2118 dt. 24/27-9-89 is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

2. The case of the management of Moonidih Project, as disclosed in the written statement-cum-rejoinder details apart, is as follows :

The present reference is not legally maintainable. At the request of several unions, it was decided in the year 1986-87 to give relief to permanent residents of Coalfield areas by providing employment in consideration of the general damage caused to surface land by mining operations apart from creation of environmental pollution. Some persons produced certificate based on false declaration of father's name, home address etc. and managed to secure employment. The concerned workman was one of such persons who made false declaration and sneaked into service. In 1989 it was detected that the concerned person was not the son of Buja Bouri of Village—Gopinathpur, P. O. Lalpur, Distt. Dhanbad. He falsely declared himself as son of Buja Bouri of Village—Gopinathpur to take advantage of the employment facility provided to permanent residents of Dhanbad District. In the circumstances, he was issued with a chargesheet dated 7/8-3-1989. He submitted his reply dated 14-3-89 accepting his guilt of providing false declaration. He has admitted that his father's name is Fulari Bouri and not Buja Bouri. He has taken the plea that Buja Bouri is his relative and he was staying with him at the relevant time. The writer of the document has made mistake and showed him as the son of Buja Bouri. His defence plea was considered as an afterthought and not genuine. In large number of documents written by several persons he described himself as the son of Buja Bouri and hence the management did not find his reply satisfactory and appointed Shri R. C. Srivastava, Senior Personnel Officer as Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer held departmental enquiry in conformance to the principle of natural justice and submitted his report holding the concerned workmen guilty of the charge levelled against him. The General Manager/C.M.E. concurred with the findings of the Enquiry Officer and approved of the dismissal of the concerned workman from service. Accordingly, he was dismissed from service with effect from 24-9-89 by letter issued under the signature of the Project Officer/Agent of Moonidih Project.

3. The case of the concerned workman, as appearing in the written statement submitted on his behalf, is that he was appointed as a permanent miner/loader by the management after taking interview. He was

appointed against permanent vacancy by M/s. BCC Ltd. as per its own requirement. He is an illiterate Harijan workman. He was residing at Moonidih colliery with his relative. All the formalities and the form required to be filled up for the sake of appointment were done by some literate persons and at that time due to an inadvertent mistake his father's name was wrongly recorded as Buja Bouri. In fact his father's name is Fulari Bouri. He was not appointed in place of Buja Bouri or as the dependant of Buja Bouri. Despite these facts, the management issued him a chargesheet dated 8-3-89 on the alleged ground of theft, fraud, dishonesty and for giving false information. He submitted his reply to the chargesheet denying the charges emphatically. He has represented that due to inadvertence or mistake his father's name has been recorded as Buja Bouri whereas his actual father's name is Fulari Bouri. He also represented that he was residing with his relative and for that reason his father's name has been inadvertently written as Buja Bouri. In spite of the aforesaid fact, the management dismissed him from service after conducting invalid and irregular enquiry. He represented to the management several times against the illegal and arbitrary dismissal, but the management refused to reinstate him in service. In the circumstances, he raised an industrial dispute before the A.L.U. (C), Dhanbad. The conciliation proceeding ended in a failure due to adamant attitude of the management and the appropriate Government has referred the present dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal. In the circumstances, he has prayed that an award be passed directing the management to reinstate him in service with full back wages.

4. In rejoinder to the written statement of the concerned workman, the management has stated that the concerned workman was originally appointed as temporary miner/loader. The management has further submitted that he was appointed under special conditions as temporary miner/loader to be absorbed subsequently on permanent post. It has been asserted that he purposely and knowingly declared his father's name as Buja Bouri of Village-Gopinathpur, District Dhanbad. Since he made false declaration, his misconduct is established. It has been denied that the management held invalid and irregular domestic enquiry and asserted that the domestic enquiry was held fairly and properly.

5. In rejoinder to the written statement of the management, the concerned workman has specifically denied the statement of facts made by the management for providing employment to the permanent residents of Coalfield areas or that he falsely declared himself as the son of Buja Bouri of Village-Gopinathpur P. O. Lalpur, District Dhanbad in order to take advantage as permanent resident of Dhanbad District. He has asserted that declaration of his father's name as Buja Bouri instead of Fulari Bouri was due to inadvertence or mistake. He has asserted that the domestic enquiry was not held in conformance to the principles of natural justice.

6. At the instance of the management the propriety and fairness of the domestic enquiry was considered as preliminary issue.

In the course of hearing on preliminary issue the management examined one witness MW-1 R. C. Srivastava, who held domestic enquiry and laid in evidence a mass of documents which have been marked as Ext. M-1 to M-11. The concerned workman did not adduce any evidence other oral or documentary at the time of hearing the preliminary issue.

7. Admittedly, Sohan Bouri, the concerned workman, was appointed Miner/Loader by the management after interview. According to the management, he sneaked into the employment by making false declaration with respect to his father's name in order to take advantage of the employment facility provided to permanent residents of Dhanbad District and that he disclosed his father's name as Buja Bouri instead of Fulari Bouri who was his father. It is the further case of the management that it was detected in 1989 that he was not the son of Bouri of Village-Gopinathpur P.O. Lalpur, District Dhanbad and accordingly a chargesheet was issued to him. The chargesheet (Ext. M.-11) reads as follows :

"You were appointed as Temp. Miner/Loader in the year 1986. At the time of appointment you submitted papers mentioning therein that you are a son of Sri Buja Bouri of Village-Gopinathpur, Post-Lalpur Dist.-Dhanbad. But in the family details submitted by Sri Buja Bouri who is an employee of Moonidih Project, your name is not recorded as his son. Further, one witness who had signed on your verification roll has also given in writing that you are not son of Sri Buja Bouri.

This shows that at the time of employment, you gave wrong information regarding your father's name and got employment by furnishing false information.

Your above acts constitute serious misconduct under clause 17(1)(a) and 17(1)(o) of the Certified Standing Order applicable to Moonidih Project which reads as under :-

17(1) (a) : "Theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employer's business or property.

17(1) (o) : Giving false information regarding one's name, age, father's name, qualification or previous service at the time of employment.

You are hereby asked to explain in writing within 72 hours of the receipt of this chargesheet showing cause as to why disciplinary action amounting even to dismissal should not be taken against you for committing above mentioned acts of misconduct.

Should you fail to submit your explanation as directed above, it will be presumed that you have no explanations to offer and, thereafter, the management will take further action on merit of the case.

Till further order you will remain suspended. You are directed to get your attendance marked in M.T.K. Section daily at 9 a.m."

The concerned workman submitted his reply to the chargesheet denying the charge. The reply to the Chargesheet (Ext. M-2) reads as follows :

"That there is no gainsaying the fact that I am the son of Sri Fulari Bouri and not of Sri Buja Bouri. But this mistake is bonafide and not all at intentional. The reason for this mistake is that at the time of my appointment as a temporary miner/loader I used to stay in the residence of my relative Sri Buja Bouri and my present address was same. It is probable that while dictating the address and name of my guardian Sri Buja Bouri, the writer of my application, forms etc. my father's name might have been written by him as Sri Buja Bouri. I am an illiterate person and I could not verify as to what has been written in the application forms etc. by one who wrote them on my behalf. To be very frank an illiterate person is of no account, and a literate person mostly does care as to what an illiterate person says or thinks or what his view is, and a literate person mostly impose his views while writing about an illiterate person.

2. That I was given employment in accordance with the Scheme of Employment to the members of the Scheduled Caste to which I also belong. I was not given employment in place of my relative Sri Buja Bouri. My appointment was quite different from that under V.R.S. or under para 10.4.2 of N.C.W.A.II upheld by III. As such there was no necessity at all to conceal my father's name and Sri Buja Bouri as my father. As such you will kindly appreciate that this mistake is quite bonafide and there was no guilty intention on my part for this wrong information and I have caused no loss or injury to the management in any manner whatsoever. By no stretch of imagination it can be inferred that I had any need to impersonate anybody for the procurement of my employment under the management.
3. That you are at the helm of affairs of this project and I am a humble poor workman under you. I need not elaborate much to make you understand my bonafide in this respect. I deny the charges levelled against me, as I have fallen a victim of circumstances and I confess that I had never any intention or necessity to show Sri Bupa Bouri as my father and this is merely a mistake.

Under the above circumstances I say that the said mistake is quite bonafide and not at all deliberate and I have not caused my loss, injury or damage to the management in any way. I would, therefore, pray to your honour to consider my above statements and submissions in their correct perspective, withdraw the chargesheet and suspension order and allow me to join duty with full wages for the period of suspension. Whatever may be the reason for this mistake. I

am sure that I am not guilty but still it is a mistake for me and on my behalf and for this I would further pray to your honour to kindly excuse and condone me and for this act of your grace I shall be highly obliged to you.

I fervently hope and trust that you will give your valuable thoughts to my above submissions and do justice to me, a poor and innocent worker under you."

8. Admittedly, the concerned workman is the son of Fulari Bouri and not Buja Bouri. The contention of the management is that he made false declaration with regard to his father's name in order to take advantage of the employment facility provided to permanent residents of Dhanbad District. It appears that he submitted verification roll, attestation form and identity certificate all written in English, wherein he disclosed his father's name as Buja Bouri and that he belongs to Scheduled Caste community. His case is that he is an illiterate person belonging to Harijan community and that the scribe of these documents made a mistake while writing out his father's name. The evidence on record indicates that the concerned workman is an illiterate person and he belongs to Scheduled Caste community. As I have stated before, all the documents as aforesaid have been written in English. There is no evidence on record to indicate that these documents were read over to him by the scribe. The management has suggested that he disclosed his father's name falsely as Buja Bouri in order to sneak into the employment provided to permanent residents of Dhanbad District. There is absolutely no evidence on record to indicate that the management provided employment facility to permanent residents of Dhanbad District at the time when the concerned workman got the employment. He has not secured the employment in place of Buja Bouri nor has he got the employment as dependant of Buja Bouri. The management gave him employment as temporary miner/loader after he was found suitable in the interview. In the circumstances, it remains inexplicable as to why he should resort to falsehood in disclosing his father's name. Documents referred to above have all been written in English. Since there is no evidence on record that the scribe of these documents read over the contents thereof to him in Hindi, the possibility of disclosure of the father's name of the concerned workman by way of mistake or inadvertance on the part of the scribe cannot be ruled out.

9. The charge against the concerned workman is on two counts—(i) theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with employer's business or property and (ii) for giving false information regarding one's name, age, father's name, qualification or previous service at the time of employment.

Admittedly, he did not commit any theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with his employer's business or property. Now it remains for consideration as to whether he gave false information regarding his father's name at the time of his employment.

The word 'false' may be used in wider or narrower sense. In the wider sense it will include all types of falsehoods, whether they be intentional or innocent,

but in the narrower sense it will cover only such falsehood which are intentional. Dismissal from service is a penal action and in the circumstances the word 'false' should be construed strictly. The contour of the expression 'false information' should be comprehended as wilful mis-information or deliberate deceptive information. In the present case there is no evidence to indicate that the concerned workman provided wilful mis-information or resorted to deliberate deceptive information in the matter of disclosure of his father's name. He provided wrong or incorrect information about the name of his father. But wrong or incorrect information is not comparable to or can be equated with false information. That being so, the charge against him for providing false information with regard to his father's name is not sustainable. Accordingly, the report of the Enquiry Officer holding him guilty of the charge levelled against him and subsequently his dismissal from service on the basis of the report of the Enquiry Officer is not also justified.

10. Accordingly, the following award is rendered—the action of the management of Neonidih Project under M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. in awarding punishment of dismissal to Shri Sohan Bouri, Miner/Loader, with effect from 24/27-9-89 is not justified. The order of dismissal of the concerned workman from service as passed by the management is hereby set aside. The management is directed to reinstate him in service with effect from the date of his dismissal from service and to pay him full back wages from the date of his dismissal till he is allowed to resume his duty. The management is further directed to allow him to resume duty within one month from the date of publication of the award and the concerned workman is also directed to report for his duty within that period.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 754—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक समीक्षा के प्रवर्धन के सबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मियों के बीच, अनुसूच में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पक्षों को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 11-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[गुप्तता एन-12011/49/89-आई आर (बैंक I)]

गुणगण चन्द्र शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1992

S.O. 754.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Hadoti-Kshetriya Gramin Bank, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-1992.

[No. L-12011/49/89-IR(Bank-I)]

S. C. SHARMA, Desk Officer

सायब/एन, औद्योगिक स्वायत्तिकाकरण कोटा (राजस्थान)

निर्देश प्रकरण नमः आ. आ. के (केन्द्रीय)—13/1989

दिनांक स्थापित : 17/10/89

परमेश्वर भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली में स्थापित

संख्या एन-12011/49/89 आई आर/बैंक ए आई

दिनांक 5 अक्टूबर, 1989

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

पक्ष

हरीशचन्द्र लववशी द्वारा श्री दिनेशराय द्विवेदी,

117 प्रभाकरपुर दावाबड़ी, कोटा।

—प्राचीन जगित

एवं

चेयरमैन, राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, न्यायपुर, कोटा

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री जगदीश नारायण शर्मा

आर. एन. जे. एन

प्राचीन अधिकारी और प्रतियोगिता

श्री दिनेशराय द्विवेदी एवं

श्री हरीशचन्द्र लववशी

(अधिकार स्वयं)

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि: श्री एम. सी. गुप्ता

अधिनियम दिनांक: 6 अक्टूबर, 1992

अधिनियम

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय द्वारा निम्न निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10(1)(घ) एवं उपधारा (2 ए) के अन्तर्गत इस स्वायत्तिकाकरण को अधिनियमार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया है—

“Whether the action of the Chairman, Hadoti Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Kota in terminating the services of Shri Haribaboo Lavvanshi w.e.f. 7-5-86 is justified? If not, to what relief workman is entitled?”

2. निर्देश न्यायालय में प्राप्त होने पर दर्ज रजिस्टर किया गया था पक्षकारों को सूचना भिजवायी गयी। दोनों पक्षों की ओर से प्राचीन-प्रतियोगिता उपस्थिति न्यायालय में दी गयी।

3. श्रम स्वयं अधिकारी हरीशचन्द्र लववशी एवं प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक प्रबन्धक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि श्री एम. सी. गुप्ता उपस्थित हुए। पक्षकारों में ग्राह्य प्राचीन अधिकारी की ओर से क्लेम स्टेटमेंट प्रस्तुत किया जाता था। परन्तु प्रतिक में क्लेम स्टेटमेंट के स्थान पर प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत कर निवेदन किया कि यह इस प्रकरण को आगे नहीं चलाना चाहता है और विवाद रहित अधिनियमार्थ पानि दिये जाने का निवेदन करता है। अतः स्वयं अधिकारी के उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के आधार पर इस प्रकरण में कोई कार्यवाही उसके आगे नहीं जाने से 'विवाद रहित' अधिनियमार्थ पानि किया जाता है।

इस अधिनियम को भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जाता है ए. ए.।

हस्ताक्षर

जगदीश नारायण शर्मा,

देस खोज

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 755—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार डिपार्टमेंट आफ टेक्निकल एडुकेशन, नई

दिल्ली, के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजक और उनके काम-कारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।
[एल-40012/31/89-डी II (बी) (पी टी)]
के. वी. श्री उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th February, 1992

S.O. 755.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of D/o Telecommunication, New Delhi and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-1992.

[No. L-40012/31/89-DII(B)(Pt.)]
K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

अनुबंध

न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण कोटा (राजस्थान)
निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक ओ. न्या. रे. (केन्द्रीय) 16/1989
दिनांक स्थापित : 3/11/89

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के
आदेश क्रमशः एल. 40012/31/89-डी-2
(बी) दि. 23/10/89

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

रामनाथ रेगर द्वारा श्री विनेशराय त्रिवेदी,
117 प्रतापनगर, दादाबाड़ी, कोटा

—प्रार्थी श्रमिक

एवं

डिविजनल इंजीनियर (आर. ई. दूरसंचार विभाग,
बी-1/10, कम्पुनिटी सेंटर जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली।

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री जगदीश नारायण शर्मा,
आर एच. जे एस

प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि : श्री डी. आर. त्रिवेदी
प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से : कोई उपस्थित नहीं
अधिनियम दिनांक 9 जनवरी, 1992

अधिनियम

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय द्वारा निम्न निर्देश
औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (जिसे तदुपरान्त
“अधिनियम 1947” से सम्बोधित किया जायेगा) की धारा
10(1)(घ) व उपधारा (2-क) के अन्तर्गत इस
न्यायाधिकरण को अधिनियमार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया है :-

“Whether the action of the Divisional Engineer
(RE) Deptt. of Telecommunication, New
Delhi in terminating of the services of

Sh. Ramnath Regar, w.e.f. 1-2-88 is justified?
If not, what relief the workman is entitled
to ?”

2. निर्देश न्यायालय में प्राप्त होने पर दर्ज रजिस्टर
किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना भिजवाई गयी।

3. प्रार्थी श्रमिक रामनाथ द्वारा अपने क्लेम स्टेटमेंट
में कहा गया है कि वह प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक डिविजनल
इंजीनियर (आर. ई.) टेलीकम्युनिकेशन विभाग के अधीन
श्रमिक के रूप में दिनांक 1/9/86 से नियोजित किया गया
था और उसने प्रतिपक्षी के यहाँ 31-1-88 तक कार्य किया।
दिनांक 1-2-88 से प्रतिपक्षी ने बिना कोई कारण बताये
श्रमिक को सेवा में लेने से मना कर दिया और प्रार्थी
श्रमिक के पूछे जाने पर प्रतिपक्षी के अधिकारी सहायक
इंजीनियर (टेलीकोम) आर. ई. कोटा ने बताया कि उसकी
सेवाएँ समाप्त कर दी गयी हैं। इस प्रकार प्रार्थी की सेवाएं
उक्त तरीके से समाप्त करने का कोई कारण नहीं बताया
गया न प्रार्थी को सेवा से हटाने के पूर्व सूचना दी गयी और
न ही सेवा से हटाने के समय कोई सूचना वेतन तथा
मुआवजा दिया गया। इस प्रकार प्रार्थी को छटनी के रूप
में सेवा से हटाया गया और अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा
25-एफ के प्रावधान की पालना नहीं की गयी इसलिए
प्रार्थी को सेवा से हटाने का आदेश अवैध है और अनुतोष
में प्रार्थी ने उसे सेवा के समस्त तमों सहित पुनः सेवा में
लिये जाने की प्रार्थना की।

4. प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से बावजूद तामील के
कोई उपस्थित नहीं आया इस कारण उसके विरुद्ध 16/8/90
को एकपक्षीय कार्यवाही की गयी।

5. प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से एकपक्षीय साक्ष्य में
स्वयं का शपथ पत्र तथा कुछ प्रलेख भी पेश किये गये हैं
एकपक्षीय बहस श्रमिक प्रतिनिधि की सुनी गयी व पचावली
का अवलोकन किया गया।

6. जो उपरोक्त तथ्य प्रार्थी श्रमिक ने अपने क्लेम
स्टेटमेंट में बताये हैं उनके समर्थन में उसने स्वयं के शपथ
पत्र में कहा है कि वह 1/9/86 से प्रतिपक्षी के यहाँ श्रमिक
के पद पर नियोजित किया गया था और उसने लगातार
31-1-88 तक कार्य किया और उसे अकस्मात् 1/2/88 से
काम से हटा दिया और काम से हटाने का कारण पूछने
पर उसे प्रतिपक्षी के अधिकारी सहायक इंजीनियर (टेलीकोम)
आर. ई. कोटा ने बताया कि उसकी सेवाएँ समाप्त कर
दी गयीं, परन्तु सेवा समाप्त करने का कोई कारण नहीं
बताया गया सेवा से हटाने के पूर्व उसे कोई सूचना नहीं
दी गयी व कोई नोटिस वेतन तथा मुआवजा भी नहीं दिया
गया। अपने कथन के समर्थन में प्रार्थी श्रमिक ने सहायक
अभियन्ता (टेलीकोम) (आर. ई.) कोटा कार्यालय के
श्रमिक के कार्यविवरण पत्र की प्रति पेश की है जिससे स्पष्ट
होता है कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक द्वारा प्रतिपक्षी के यहाँ एक वर्ष

से अधिक अवधि तक कार्य किया गया था। इस प्रलेख में श्रमिक की कुल उपस्थिति 378 + 58 तथा इसके नीचे 391 + 58 दिन बताई गयी है। इस प्रकार श्रमिक ने निर्धारित एक वर्ष की अवधि से अधिक अवधि तक कार्य किया है। इसके अतिरिक्त श्रमिक की साक्ष्य में यह भी स्पष्ट है कि इस छंटनी के पूर्व उसे प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा कोई नोटिस नहीं दिया गया और न अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 25 एफ के प्रावधानान्तर्गत एक माह के नोटिस का वेतन तथा छंटनी का मुआवजा किया गया। इस प्रकार इन आवश्यक प्रावधानों की पालना इस छंटनी के पूर्व प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा नहीं की गयी, यह श्रमिक की साक्ष्य से स्पष्ट प्रतीत होता है। इस प्रकार प्रार्थी श्रमिक को प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक द्वारा सेवा से पृथक् करना अनुचित पाया जाता है और वह पुनः सेवा में सभी वेतन लाभ सहित प्रतिपक्षी के यहां आने का अधिकारी पाया जाता है।

7. उक्त सम्पूर्ण विवेचन के आधार पर भारत सरकार श्रम मंत्रालय द्वारा सम्प्रेषित निदेश को इस प्रकार उत्तरित किया जाता है कि प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक डिविजनल इंजीनियर (आर. ई.) टेलीकम्यूनिकेशन विभाग, नई दिल्ली द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक रामनाथ रेगर को सेवा से पृथक् करना अनुचित है, फलस्वरूप श्रमिक रामनाथ रेगर प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक के यहां पिछले सम्पूर्ण वेतन व सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित पुनः सेवा में आने का अधिकारी है।

इस अधिनिर्णय को भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जावे।

जगदीश, नारायण न्यायाधीश ,

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 1992

का. प्रा. 756.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार निम्नचा कोलियरी आफ मे. ई. सी. एल. प्रबंधन के संबंध में निोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-2-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012(106)/90-आर्. आर. (सी.-II)]
राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th February, 1992

S.O. 756.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Nimcha Colliery of M/s. E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10-2-1992.

[No. L-22012(106)90-IR(C.II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ASANSOL

REFERENCE NO. 38/90

PRESENT :

Shri N. K. Saha,
Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of
Nimcha Colliery of M/s. E.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri P. K. Das, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri B. Kumar, Joint Secretary of the Union.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

State : West Bengal.

Dated, the 31st January, 1992

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide Ministry's Order No. L-22012(106)90-IR(C.II) dated 10-9-1990.

Schedule

"Whether the demand of Koyala Mazdoor Congress (the union espousing the dispute) for promotion of S/Sri K. N. Singh and J. P. Singh, Asstt. Lamp Room Incharge Tech. & Suvy. Grd. D to the post of Lamp Room Incharge, Tech. & Suvy Gr. C w.e.f. 5th October 1985 from which Sri B. N. Singh was promoted, was justified? If so, to what relief the concerned workmen were entitled?"

2. To-day (31-1-92) Sri B. Kumar, Joint Secretary of the union submits that the union is not interested to contest the case since the concerned workmen are absenting inspite of instructions.

3. In view of the above submission there is no other alternative but to pass a no-dispute award in this case and accordingly a no-dispute award is passed.

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 1992

का. प्रा. 757.—बीडी श्रमिक कल्याण निधि नियम, 1978 के नियम 3 के उपनियम (2), नियम 4 एवं नियम 16 के साथ पठित बीडी श्रमिक कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 62) की धारा 5 द्वारा प्रस्तुत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा इस अधिसूचना के जारी होने की तारीख से राजस्थान राज्य के लिए निम्नानुसार सलाहकार समिति रचित करती है, अर्थात् :—

(1) श्रम मंत्री,
राजस्थान सरकार

—अध्यक्ष;

(2) कल्याण आयुक्त, भिलवाड़ा	--उपाध्यक्ष (पदेन)	बीड़ी कर्मचारी यूनियन, सीटू, बाड़ा (राजस्थान)	
(3) श्रीम आयुक्त, राजस्थान, जयपुर	--सदस्य (पदेन)	(8) श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह, प्रधान सचिव, बीड़ी मजदूर यूनियन, --नन्दपुरी, --अजमेर	--कर्मकार प्रतिनिधि
(4) श्री महावीर प्रसाद जैन, विधान सभा सदस्य, शक घर निवासी, जिला टोंक	--राज्य विधान सभा सदस्य	(9) श्रीमती तारा भंडारी, विधान सभा सदस्य, भंडारी भवन, पुराने बस स्टैंड के पास, मिराहो	--महिला प्रतिनिधि
(5) श्री अब्दुल सईद, राजस्थान बीड़ी फैक्ट्री, श्रीपुरा, कोटा, (राजस्थान)	नियोजक प्रतिनिधि	(10) कल्याण प्रशासक, भिलवाड़ा	--सचिव
(6) श्री मोहन लाल खत्री, बीड़ी निर्माता, चीपा मोहल्ला, भरतपुर (राजस्थान)			
(7) श्री अब्दुल अजीज, अध्यक्ष,	कर्मकार प्रतिनिधि		

2. उक्त सनाहकार समिति का मुख्यालय भिलवाड़ा में होगा।
[मं. पृ - 19112/7/89 - डब्ल्यू. II (सं.)]
श्री. डी. नागर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th February, 1992

S.O. 757.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Beedi Workers Welfare Fund Act, 1976 (62 of 1976), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 3, rule 4 and rule 16 of the Beedi Workers Welfare Fund Rules, 1978, the Central Government hereby constitutes the Advisory Committee for the State of Rajasthan with effect from the date of issue of this notification as follows, namely :—

(1) Labour Minister, Government of Rajasthan	Chairman
(2) Welfare Commissioner, Bhilwara.	Vice-Chairman (Ex-officio)
(3) Labour Commissioner, Rajasthan, Jaipur.	Member (Ex-Officio)
(4) Shri Mahavir Prasad Jain, Member of Legislative Assembly, Post Nivai, District Tonk.	Member of State Legislature.
(5) Shri Abdul Said, The Rajasthan Beedi Factory, Shripura, Kota (Rajasthan).	Employers' Representatives.
(6) Shri Mohan Lal Khatri, Beedi Producer, Cheepa Mohalla, Bharatpur (Rajasthan).	
(7) Shri Abdul Aaziz, President, Beedi Karamchari Union, CITU, Bara (Rajasthan).	Workers' Representative.

- (8) Shri Laxman Singh,
Chief Secretary, — Workers' Representative
Beedi Mazdoor Union,
Anandpuri,
Ajmer.
- (9) Smt. Tara Bhandari, Woman Representative.
Member of Legislative Assembly
Bhandari Bhawan,
Near Old Bus Stand,
Sirohi.
- (10) Welfare Administrator, Secretary
Bhilwara.

2. The headquarters of the said Advisory Committee shall be at Bhilwara.

[No. U-19012/7/89/-W.II(C)]
V.D. NAGAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 758 बीडी कर्मकार कल्याण निधि नियम, 1978 के नियम 3 के उप नियम (2) के साथ पठित बीडी कर्मकार कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 62) की धारा 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा केरल सरकार के साथ विचार-विमर्श के पश्चात् श्री श्री. पी. रामकृष्ण पिल्लै जो कि अब उक्त विधान सभा के सदस्य नहीं रहे के स्थान पर श्री अरयादन मोहम्मद, सदस्य, विधान सभा, केरल को केरल राज्य संबंधी सलाहकार समिति के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और उस प्रयोजन के लिए भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II, 3, उप खंड (ii) में दिनांक 24-3-1990 को पृष्ठ 973 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की दिनांक 28 फरवरी, 1990 के कानूनी आदेश संख्या 747 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्रम संख्या 3 तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टि के लिए निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

श्री अरयादन मोहम्मद,
सदस्य विधान सभा,
अरयादन हाऊस,
पो. आ. निताम्बूर, मालापुरम,
केरल - पिनकोड - 679329

[सं. यू - 19012/8/89 - डब्ल्यू. - II (सी)]
बी. डी. नागर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th February, 1992

S.O. 758.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Beedi Workers Welfare Fund Act, 1976 (62 of 1976) read with sub-rule (2) of rule 3 of the Beedi Workers Welfare Fund Rules, 1978, the Central Government hereby appoints, in consultation with the Government of Kerala, Shri Aryadan Mohammed, Member of Legislative Assembly, Kerala to be a member of the Advisory Committee for the State of Kerala vice Shri V. P. Ramakrishna Pillai who ceased to be member of the said Assembly and for that purpose makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour number S.O. 747 dated the 28th February, 1990, published at page

973 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 24th March, 1990, namely :—

In the said notification, for serial number 3 and the entry relating thereto, the following serial number and entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“3. Shri Aryadan Mohammed,
Member of Legislative Assembly,
Aryadan House,
Nilamboor P. O.,
Malappuram,
Kerala, State,
Pin—679 329.”

[No. U-19012/8/89-W-II(C)]
V. D. NAGAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1992

का. आ. 759 केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ह) के उपखंड (vi) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 2541 दिनांक 19 सितम्बर, 1991 द्वारा बैकिंग कम्पनी द्वारा चलाया जाता है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 19 सितम्बर, 1991 में छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है,

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ह) के उपखंड (6) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 19 मार्च, 1992 में छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[संख्या एम - 11017/2/85-डी-1 (ए)]
एम. एस. पराशर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1992

S. O. 759.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provision of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 2541 dated the 19th September, 1991 the Banking Industry carried on by a Banking Company as defined in clause (bb) of section 2 of the said Act to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a period of six months from the 19th September, 1991 ;

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 19th March, 1992.

[No. S-11017/13/85-D.I(A)]

S. S. PRASHER, Under Secy.

प्रारंभ

नई दिल्ली, 10 मार्च, 1992

का. भा. 760 जबकि मारमागुआ हैडिंग एजेंट्स एसोसिएशन, वास्को डी गामा और उनके द्वारा प्रबंधित पूल के नियोक्ताओं और उनके कर्मचारियों का प्रतिनिधित्व ट्रांसपोर्ट एंड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, वास्को डा गामा ने किया, के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान था।

और जबकि, उपर्युक्त नियोक्ताओं और उनके कर्मचारियों, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व सचिव, ट्रांसपोर्ट एंड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, वास्को डा गामा ने किया, ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10क की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत एक लिखित करार किया है और वे इस विवाद को स्थायि निर्णय के लिए भेजने को सहमत हैं और उपर्युक्त माध्यस्थ करार की एक प्रति केन्द्र सरकार को भेज दी गई है,

अतः अब केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उपर्युक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10(क) की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में उपर्युक्त करार को प्रकाशित करती है।

करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10क के अंतर्गत)
पक्षकार

पक्षकारों के नाम

नियोक्ताओं के प्रतिनिधि	कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधि
1. अध्यक्ष, मारमागुआ हैडिंग एजेंट्स एसोसिएशन, पेरियर बैम्बर्स, वास्को डा गामा, गोवा	सचिव ट्रांसपोर्ट एंड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, प. धर्मानन्द कोशाम्बे बिल्डिंग, सी/8, दूसरा मंज, स्वतंत्र पथ, वास्को डा गामा, गोवा

दोनों पक्षों में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित विवाद को सेवा निवृत्त न्यायाधीश श्री गुस्ताव कोटो पणजी के माध्यस्थता के भेजने के लिए सहमति हुई।

(i) विवाद के विनिष्ट मामले :

(मारमागुआ हैडिंग एजेंट्स एसोसिएशन के प्रबंधन और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच 23-6-85 और 13-12-88 को हुए संसंधन समझौते पर ध्यान देते हुए क्या कर्मकार मंहगाई भत्ते में हुई वृद्धि या कमी की एवज में नियोक्ता द्वारा दिए जाने वाले लाभों के अनिश्चित 1-1-86 में मारमागुआ डाक लेबर बोर्ड के कर्मचारियों को दिए जाने वाले मजदूरी लाभ प्राप्त करने के हकदार हैं ?

क्या 13-12-1988 को नियोक्ताओं और कर्मचारियों के बीच हुए समझौते के बाद भी कर्मचारियों द्वारा इन मजदूरी लाभों का दावा करना स्थायीचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो वे क्या अनुतोष पाने के हकदार हैं ?

(ii) विवाद के पक्षों का व्यौरा जिसमें संबद्ध प्रतिष्ठान या उपक्रम का नाम तथा पता भी शामिल है ;

जैसा कि पहले ही उल्लेख कर दिया गया है।

(iii) कर्मचारियों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले संघों का नाम :

(क) ट्रांसपोर्ट एंड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, वास्को-डा-गामा, गोवा

(iv) उपक्रमों में नियोजित प्रभावित कर्मचारियों की कुल संख्या 607

(v) विवाद के कारण प्रभावित या विरुद्ध प्रभावित हूटों का संभावना है उन उम्मीदवारों की अनुमानित संख्या 607

हम इस बात से भी सहमत हैं कि माध्यस्थता द्वारा विवादों का निपटारा करने के लिए हम बाध्य हैं।

हम छह माह के दौरान या आगे की उपप्राप्ति के अंदर जो कि हमारे बीच परस्पर लिखित समझौते द्वारा तय की जाएगी, पंचाट दे देगा। यदि ऊपर लिखित अवधि के अंदर पंचाट नहीं दिया जाता है तो माध्यस्थता की मध्यस्थता अपने आप निरस्त हो जाएगी और हम तब माध्यस्थता के लिए बर्ता करने को सन्नत होंगे।

नियोक्ता का प्रतिनिधि कर्मकार का प्रतिनिधि

ह०/	ह०/—
(श्रीमती एम. पेरियर)	(बी. एस. भांगवे)
अध्यक्ष, मारमागुआ हैडिंग एजेंट्स एसोसिएशन, वास्को-डा-गामा, गोवा	महासचिव, ट्रांसपोर्ट एंड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, वास्को-डा गामा, गोवा
गवाह :	

1. ह०/—

प्रतिनिधि

- महायुक्त श्रमायुक्त (के.) वास्को-डा-गामा, गोवा
- श्रेणीय श्रमायुक्त (के.), वेल्कीस्ट हाउस, बेनार्ड एस्टेट बम्बई-400038
- मुख्य श्रमायुक्त (के.), श्रम शक्ति भवन, नई दिल्ली
- भारत सरकार के सचिव, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली

[सं. ए. - 36013/1/91 - आई. आर. (मिम)]
बी. एम डेविड, डैस्क अधिकारी, (आई आर) (मिम.)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th March, 1992

S.O. 760.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Mormugao Handling Agents Association Vasco da gama and Pool managed by them and their workmen represented by Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Vasco da Gama, Goa.

And whereas, the said employers and their workmen represented by the Secretary, Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Vasco da gama have by written agreement under sub-section (i) of Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Govt. a copy of the said arbitration agreement;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 10(A) of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said Agreement.

AGREEMENT

(Under Section 10 A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

BETWEEN

Name of the Parties.

Representing employers :

1. The President,
Mormugao Handling Agents
Association,
Pereira Chambers,
Vasco-da-gama,
GOA.

Representing Workmen

The Secretary,
Transport & Dock Workers'
Union,
Pt Dharmanand Kossambe
Building,
C/8, 2nd Floor,
Swatantra Path,
Vasco-da-gama, Goa.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of Shri Retd. Justice Mr. Gustavo Couto, Panaji.

(i) Specific matters in dispute.

Having regard to conciliation settlements dated 23-6-85 and 13-12-1988 between the management of Mormugao Handling Agents Association and their workmen whether the workmen are entitled to wage benefits given to the workmen of Mormugao Dock Labour Board from 1-1-86 onwards in addition to the benefits of rise or fall in Dearness Allowance given by the employer?

Whether workmen are justified in claiming such wage benefits even after the Settlement dated 13-12-88 between the employers and the workmen? If not, what relief they are entitled to?

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved;

As mentioned already.

(iii) Names of the unions representing workmen are :

(a) Transport & Dock Workers' Union, Vasco-da-Gama, Goa.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected—607.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute—607.

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of six months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period

aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Representing Employer.

Sd/-

(Mrs. M. PEREIRA)

President, Mormugao Handling Agents Association,
Vasco-da-Gama, GOA.

Representing workmen.

Sd/-

(B. S. BHONSLE)

General Secretary, Transport & Dock
Workers' Union, Vasco-da-Gama, GOA.

WITNESS :

1. Sd/-

Copy To :

1. The Asstt. Labour Commissioner(C) Vasco-da-Gama, Goa.
2. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) Wakefield House, Bellard Estate, Bombay-400038.
3. The Chief Labour Commissioner(C) Shram Shakti Bhawan, New Delhi.
4. The Secretary to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi."

[No. 36013/1/91-IR (Misc.)]

B.M. DAVID, Desk Officer IR (Misc.)

